

**BEGINNING FROM GALILEE: AN EXPLORATION OF THE USE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF GALILEE IN  
THE GOSPELS AND ACTS**

by

**DAVID FULLER CALLAWAY**

(Under the Direction of Wayne Coppins)

**ABSTRACT**

Interest in Galilee is as old as the Gospels themselves, and in recent decades scholars have approached the region with great attention. Much of this focus has centered on historical methods to understand Galilean socio-economics, demographics, and architecture. *Beginning from Galilee: An Exploration of the Use and Significance of Galilee in the Gospels and Acts* builds on this body of research by incorporating narrative analyses of the Gospels and Acts to create a deeper understanding of the region and its importance in 1<sup>st</sup> Century CE Christianity. Each chapter is devoted to a particular Gospel author, allowing individually-tailored methodological approaches that will explore the Jewishness of Galilee and its significance to each evangelist.

**INDEX WORDS:** Galilee, Jewish, Gentile, Gospels, New Testament, Narrative Analysis, Archaeology, Gospel of Matthew, Gospel of Mark, Gospel of Luke, Gospel of John, Acts of the Apostles

**BEGINNING FROM GALILEE: AN EXPLORATION OF THE USE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF GALILEE IN  
THE GOSPELS AND ACTS**

by

**DAVID FULLER CALLAWAY**

A.B., The University of Georgia, 2011

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree

**MASTER OF ARTS**

**ATHENS, GEORGIA**

2014

© 2014

David Fuller Callaway

All Rights Reserved

**BEGINNING FROM GALILEE: AN EXPLORATION OF THE USE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF GALILEE IN  
THE GOSPELS AND ACTS**

by

**DAVID FULLER CALLAWAY**

Major Professor: Wayne Coppins

Committee: Mark Chancey  
Carolyn Medine

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso  
Dean of the Graduate School  
The University of Georgia  
May 2014

## **DEDICATION**

“Surely you are not also from Galilee, are you? Search and you will see that no prophet is to arise from Galilee.” - John 7.52

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am immensely grateful for the guidance and education given to me by the entire Religion Department at the University of Georgia. In particular, Dr. Wayne Coppins has played an immeasurable part in my growth as a scholar. Dr. Coppins, I cannot thank you enough for the instruction and counsel you have given me over the last five years. You have left an indelible mark on the way I approach the New Testament for which I am exceptionally appreciative. As a scholar and educator, you will always be an inspiration. I am also deeply grateful to have worked with Dr. Carolyn Medine whose openness and intellect has continually challenged me to seek unfamiliar, fresh perspectives. Dr. Medine, your compassion and counsel have made the completion of my M.A. not only achievable, but one of the most enjoyable adventures I have experienced. Special thanks must also be given to Dr. Mark Chancey of Southern Methodist University whose work was the catalyst for my interest in Galilee. Dr. Chancey, I am incredibly grateful for your willingness to assist me throughout the writing of this thesis as well as come to Athens for its defense. Your guidance and insight have helped me shape *Beginning from Galilee* into something I am thoroughly proud of, and your amicability and enthusiasm make me look forward to my continued Galilee research with passion.

Additionally, I'd like to express my gratitude to my family who have been there unceasingly for me throughout my academic career. Thank you mom, dad, Rosie, Craig, Eric, and my entire extend family for your continued support and encouragement. Finally, I'd like to thank two other individuals who were instrumental in the development of this thesis. Tyler Kelley, your friendship has been an invaluable part of my graduate experience at UGA, and our

frequent, thought-provoking conversations about Hebrew Bible and New Testament Studies have accompanied and inspired me throughout the writing process. This thesis would not be what it is without your assistance. For that, and so much more, I am truly grateful for our friendship. Special thanks must also be given to Calley Mersmann, who proofread this entire thesis and who, over the last nine years, has helped me transform my writing from “grammatical trash” to what you read today. Calley, I cannot thank you enough for your time, patience, and willingness to help. Thank you all.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	v
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	ix
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
<b>CHAPTER</b>	
<b>1 GALILEE OF THE GENTILES</b> .....	7
Galilee of the Gentiles: Literature, Archaeology, and Interpretation .....	8
Matthew in Light of a Jewish Galilee .....	19
<b>2 GALILEE AND THE GENTILES</b> .....	29
The Geopolitical Sequence of the Gospel of Mark .....	30
From Galilee-and-Foreign-Lands to the Jewishness of Galilee .....	36
<b>3 GALILEE AND THE KINGDOM OF DAVID</b> .....	45
“Galilee” in the Gospel of Luke and Acts .....	46
“Judea” in the Gospel of Luke and Acts .....	53
Conclusions .....	58
<b>4 GALILEE AND THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD</b> .....	62
Galilee as a Safe Haven .....	63
Jesus as the Light That Comes From Galilee .....	68
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b> .....	79
<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	82



## **APPENDICES**

<b>A “GALILEE” AND “JUDEA” IN LUKE-ACTS .....</b>	<b>91</b>
---	-----------

## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1.1: Isaiah’s Prophetic Oracle in Matthew and the LXX/MT.....	23
Table 3.1: Comparison of Luke 23.5 and Acts 10.37 .....	46
Table 3.2: Comparison of Matthew 27.55-56, Mark 15.40, and Luke 23.49 .....	51
Table 3.3: Comparison of Mark 1.21-28 and Luke 4.31-37 .....	52
Table 3.4: Comparison of Matthew 4.23, Mark 1.39, and Luke 4.44.....	57
Table A.1: Classifications of “Galilee” in Luke-Acts .....	91
Table A.2: Distinct and Ambiguous References to Galilee.....	91
Table A.3: Non-unique Occurrences of “Galilee” in Luke and the Type of Material	
They Appear In .....	91
Table A.4: Unique Occurrences of “Galilee” in Luke and the Type of Material	
They Appear In .....	92
Table A.5: Classifications of “Judea” in Luke-Acts.....	92
Table A.6: Distinct and Comprehensive References to Judea.....	93
Table A.7: Non-unique Occurrences of “Judea” in Luke and the Type of Material	
They Appear In .....	93
Table A.8: Unique Occurrences of “Judea” in Luke and the Type of Material	
They Appear In .....	93

## INTRODUCTION

Galilee is a land of rich history whose bucolic, peaceful geography betrays its place as a political hotbed of conflict. It was the birthplace of Rabbinic Judaism after the fall of Jerusalem and the home of Jesus of Nazareth, who in Galilee, before carrying that title to his death, would heal the sick; call the disciples; and charge his poor, meek, hungering followers to treat others as they themselves wished to be treated and the land where Jesus made his resurrection known to those who would go on to spread his message to all the nations; a message that began in Galilee. Given the historical significance of Galilee, it may come as no surprise that the region is at the center of modern scholarly efforts to understand Jesus and his world. Ronald Deines goes as far as framing the entire Third Quest for the Historical Jesus as Galilee research,<sup>1</sup> while Sean Freyne admits, “More than once I have been tempted to make the fairly obvious comment that the search for the historical Galilee is about to replace the quest for the historical Jesus.”<sup>2</sup> Yet, the historical Galilee has only recently been sought after, despite the now obvious importance of recovering it to aid our understanding of Jesus and early Christianity.

The beginnings of the academic Galilee movement were brought about by modern Jewish studies of Jesus, wherein the region was used to contrast an ignorant, backwoods, Halakhah-hating yet supremely charismatic Jesus with his knowledgeable, law-abiding Pharisaic Judean/Jerusalemite counterparts.<sup>3</sup> In this climate, German ideologically-driven studies of Galilee assert a Hellenistic origins for Christianity, arguing that a Hellenized, and therefore

---

<sup>1</sup> Deines 2013, 55.

<sup>2</sup> Freyne 2007, 13.

<sup>3</sup> See Graetz 1891, 146-165 and Strauss 1865, 344-346.

pagan, Galilee could not have produced a Jewish Jesus,<sup>4</sup> a mindset that would be carried forward into the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century.<sup>5</sup> Subsequently, in 1980, Sean Freyne's *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian: A Study of Second Temple Judaism* was published, launching the most recent phase of Galilee research. Along with Freyne,<sup>6</sup> scholars such as Eric Meyers,<sup>7</sup> Richard Horsley,<sup>8</sup> and more recently Mark Chancey<sup>9</sup> have contributed to reshaping our understanding of Galilee into a Hellenized but fundamentally Jewish land.

*Beginning from Galilee: an Exploration of the Use and Significance of Galilee in the Gospels and Acts* uses this most recent Galilee Studies framework and seeks to integrate both historical research and narrative analysis, arguing that the convergence of these approaches can mutually confirm their separate conclusions and, more importantly, produce a more comprehensive understanding of the region. Additionally, this thesis sets out contribute to current discussions in New Testament Studies on topics such as the Jewishness of Galilean demographics and the use of the Scriptures of Israel in the New Testament. More broadly, such work is essential for understanding an interesting and important tension between early Christian writings and historical reality: the significance of Galilee to the received tradition alongside the sole preservation of an account which depicts the growth of the church from Jerusalem/Judea rather than Galilee. While the resolution of this tension lies outside the scope of the thesis, an examination of the region's use and importance in the Gospels, the heart of the research presented here, is a necessary first step toward understanding Galilee's significance in both secular and religious history. An entirely exhaustive discussion of Galilee in each of the Gospels

---

<sup>4</sup> Freyne 2000, 8; see Schürer 1890.

<sup>5</sup> See Gerdmar 2009, especially 531-553.

<sup>6</sup> E.g. Freyne 1980, 1988, 1997, 2000, 2007.

<sup>7</sup> E.g. Meyers 1976, 1987, 1997; Meyers and Strange 1981.

<sup>8</sup> E.g. Horsley 1995, 1996.

<sup>9</sup> E.g. Chancey 2002, 2005; Meyers and Chancey 2012.

and Acts is an effort that would require significantly more pages than are present here; however, each chapter will discuss key issues and encourage discussion in future Galilee Studies.

### **Beginning from Galilee: An Outline**

Galilee's religious identity is a recurring topic throughout this thesis, and thus, Chapter One: "Galilee of the Gentiles" in many ways serves as an extended and focused introduction and literature review. To understand the significance of the claims about Galilean demographics this thesis makes, the first section of Chapter One: Galilee of the Gentiles: Literature, Archaeology, and Interpretation explores the rationality behind prior scholarship identifying Galilee's population as predominantly Gentile. Both literary and archaeological evidence are reviewed to create a foundation in order to critically analyze the claims of past scholarship. Especially in this section, the work of Sean Freyne and Mark Chancey plays an integral role in determining which evidence is even applicable to a discussion about Galilee's population and how accurately that evidence may reflect historical realities. Ultimately, this section demonstrates that Galilee, despite indications of Hellenization, was still populated by a large, Jewish majority that was present during Jesus' ministry.

As this thesis' primary concern is Galilee in the Gospels, Section Two: Matthew in Light of a Jewish Galilee, transitions into a detailed case study of Matthew 4.15-16 to verify that the conclusions derived from the exploration and analysis of literary and archaeological evidence can be applied to a New Testament Gospel. In this passage, the evangelist draws upon Isaiah 8.23-9.1 to scripturally ordain Jesus' move from the wilderness to "Galilee of the Gentiles." An analysis of Matthew's use of Scripture throughout the Gospel, and his specific appropriation of Isaiah 8.23-9.1, shows that the author's first concern when applying a scriptural passage is its

ability to theologically validate and drive the narrative he is constructing. Matthew does not identify Galilee as Gentile because he believes it is an accurate statement about the Galilee of his time, but rather because the Scripture he is relying on does so; for the evangelist, the nature of Scripture's value is first and foremost theological, not historical.<sup>10</sup> Thus, Chapter One closes without strong evidence for a Gentile Galilee, and in fact evidence for the opposite conclusion.

With archaeological and textual allegations for a Gentile Galilee discredited, Chapter Two, "Galilee and the Gentiles," argues that evidence for a predominantly Jewish Galilee was present since the authorship of Mark's Gospel. Building upon the transition in Chapter One to a Gospel-centric, literary focus, Chapter Two presents a narrative analysis of the Gospel text to reach the same conclusions of recent archaeological surveys; namely, Galilee at the time of Jesus was markedly Jewish. Achieving this requires a shift away from the sometimes overwhelming focus on the timeworn geographical paradigm of Jesus' journey from Galilee to Jerusalem. While this archetype will continue to serve scholarship well in identifying major themes and concerns for the evangelist, the first section of Chapter One, the Geopolitical Sequence in the Gospel of Mark, seeks to highlight another geographical model, that of Jesus' excursions to the foreign lands. This analysis of Mark's geopolitical sequence shows that, rather than confused or inept as some have argued, the evangelist's portrayal of Jesus' journeys to foreign lands is a valid and valuable paradigm that can illuminate details that remain underdeveloped the Galilee-to-Jerusalem framework.

---

<sup>10</sup> It is not that Matthew sees no historical value in Scripture, quite the opposite; however, the historical value for the evangelist is primarily theological. That is, Matthew's use of Scripture allows him to place his narrative in a larger theological history, one in which the God of Israel has been acting *inside of* history since creation. Matthew's story is not only a continuation of this theological history, but a fulfilment of it. Recognizing this aim of the evangelist should therefore make us cautious in examining what, if any, claims the evangelist is making about what can be called secular or profane history.

From Galilee-and-Foreign-Lands to the Jewishness of Galilee, the second section of Chapter Two, studies how the evangelist portrays these regions in order to demonstrate the demographics of their populations. Whether through the presence of pigs in Gerasa or the imagery of dogs in Syrophoenicia, Mark consistently depicts these foreign lands as Gentile, which creates a powerful contrast for Jesus' time in Galilee. Galilee is where Jesus teaches in Jewish synagogues and speaks to Jewish religious leaders, and where he calls Jewish disciples to spread his ministry, all of which are absent in his travels. Thus, Galilee becomes a distinctly Jewish setting when juxtaposed with the pronounced Gentile foreign lands, a contrast not seen when comparing Galilee with Jewish Jerusalem.

While Chapters One, Two, and Four explore Galilee's use and significance inside their respective Gospels, Chapter Three, "Galilee and the Kingdom of David," must first examine a problem unique to the portrayal of the region in the Gospel of Luke. Unlike Matthew, Mark, and John, whose Galilees are distinct and separate regions from Samaria and Judea to the south, Luke seemingly uses the term "Judea" to include all of these lands under one title. Superficially, this may suggest that the author has a positive bias for Judea at the expense of Galilee, and therefore, a thorough analysis of how Luke uses "Judea" and "Galilee" throughout Luke-Acts must be undertaken before anything can be said about the significance, or lack thereof, he places on either region. Thus, the third chapter is broken into three sections, the first of which examines every instance of the term "Galilee" in Luke-Acts. In doing so, it is shown that Luke adds references to Galilee throughout his narrative, which is not consistent with the cursory conclusion that the evangelist favors Judea over Galilee. The second section performs a similar analysis of every occurrence of "Judea" in the Gospel and Acts, demonstrating that the title can stand for both the Roman province alone as well as the combined area of Judea, Samaria, and

Galilee. The final section synthesizes the results from the first two sections arguing that, while Luke may often use “Judea” as a substitute for “all Israel,” he still places a great deal of significance on Galilee, as demonstrated by the numerous times he adds “Galilee” into his reshaping of tradition that did not originally possess a reference to the region.

“Galilee and the Light of the World,” Chapter Four, closes this thesis with an analysis of Galilee’s function in the Fourth Gospel. On one level, the evangelist regularly uses the region as a safe haven for Jesus to return to in times of conflict. This is explored in the first section of Chapter Four, along with potential motives for why the evangelist chose to depict the area as such. It is suggested that Galilee’s safety in the Gospel mirrors the region’s relative good fortune compared to Roman-oppressed Judea at the time the Gospel was written, similar to the likely anachronistic treatment of the Jewish community’s expulsion from the synagogue. Section Two of the fourth chapter returns to the prophetic oracle in Isaiah 8.23-9.1 discussed heavily in “Galilee of the Gentiles.” Unlike his predecessor Matthew, John never directly quotes the oracle; however, this chapter will analyze the Fourth Gospel’s use of light imagery in order to connect it with the “great light” which shines upon those in darkness waiting for their messiah to come. While the Gospel of John is adamant that Jesus is the one who has been sent from God, also central to John’s Christology is Jesus as the light that comes from Galilee.



## CHAPTER ONE

### **GALILEE OF THE GENTILES: RECENT SCHOLARSHIP ON THE POPULATION OF GALILEE AND THE INTERPRETATION OF MATTHEW 4:15-16**

Couched in undocumented assertions and mentioned in passing as a universal, unquestionable truth, the predominately Gentile composition of Galilee's population was, for the most part, an assumed fact in New Testament studies until the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. Determining the particular source of this unfounded supposition may be impossible; however, the attempts to recover the historical Jesus, which rose out of late 18<sup>th</sup> Century Enlightened Europe, certainly helped sow the notion in the minds of future scholars and laypeople alike. D.F. Strauss, one of the most significant figures in the quest for the historical Jesus,<sup>11</sup> broke from his teacher Schleiermacher's definition of Galilee as part of a unified "Jewish Land,"<sup>12</sup> the home of Jesus' people, in favor of portraying the Jewishness (or perhaps better, Judaism-ness) of Judea and Jerusalem as antithetical to Jesus' entire mission. "Judea and its capital," he argues, "were the seat and stronghold of everything that Jesus wished to combat...there the spirit of formalism in religion, the attachments to sacrifices and purifications had its firmest hold in the numerous priesthood, the splendid Temple, and its solemn services."<sup>13</sup> Yet, Historical Jesus Studies may have been corrected when, in 1953, N.A. Dahl,<sup>14</sup> argued for a new method that placed 1<sup>st</sup> Century CE Judaism at the center.<sup>15</sup> This approach and works such as E.P. Sander's *Jesus and*

---

<sup>11</sup> See Beilby and Eddy 2009, 15-17 for a brief overview of Strauss' influence.

<sup>12</sup> See Schleiermacher 1997, 172-173 – Schleiermacher's portrayal of Galilee is not without its own problems, namely the complete assimilation of Galilean culture/identity into Judean culture/identity.

<sup>13</sup> Strauss 1865, 345.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Käsemann 1964.

<sup>15</sup> Dahl 1991, 96.

*Judaism*, which helped define it, set the stage for scholars such as Sean Freyne and Mark Chancey to definitively challenge and overturn the long standing beliefs about Galilee's heavily Gentile population.<sup>16</sup>

Both Freyne and Chancey argue for a Galilee whose majority population is, in fact, Jewish.<sup>17</sup> The question then raised is how this scholarship affects the interpretation of relevant verses in the Synoptics. For example, what does Matthew mean when he speaks of a "Galilee of the Gentiles" in 4.15, and, correspondingly, to what extent can we understand Matthew's scriptural fulfillment of Jesus to also be an accurate representation of the population of Galilee when he was writing? Laying a foundation for the rest of this thesis, this chapter critically evaluates past and present scholarship on the population of Galilee prior to and during the life of Jesus to determine the extent to which recent assertions claiming the population was predominately Jewish are valid. Then, the chapter proceeds to interpret Matthew's use of "Galilee of the Gentiles" in 4.15, highlighting its place and function in the Gospel and assessing the extent the evangelist is making claims about Galilee's actual inhabitants.

### **Galilee of the Gentiles: Literature, Archaeology, and Interpretation**

To understand the resistance from scholars such as Chancey and Freyne, one must first be familiar with the arguments that have supported past scholarship's conclusion of a predominately Gentile population in Galilee. Chancey himself outlines these arguments in *The Myth of a Gentile Galilee*,<sup>18</sup> and this chapter will briefly explore the textual and archaeological evidence that has led to incorrect assumptions concerning Galilean demographics.

---

<sup>16</sup> See Chancey 2002, 1-7 for a valuable overview of the breadth of scholarship that presumed a Gentile Galilee.

<sup>17</sup> Chancey 2002; Freyne 1980.

<sup>18</sup> Chancey 2002, 14-15.

The first textual justification arises from Isaiah 8.23,<sup>19</sup> “For there will be no gloom for those who were in distress. In the former time he made contemptible the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, but in the future he will honor the way of the sea, the land by the Jordan, Galilee of the nations.”<sup>20</sup> *Haggôim*, or “nations,” often translated as “Gentiles,” has been argued by scholars to demonstrate a non-Jewish population significant enough to affect the designation of the territory as such in the late 8<sup>th</sup> Century BCE. This argument is strengthened by the accounts in 2 Kings 15-18 and I Chronicles 5, wherein, between the years of 740 and 722 BCE, Assyrian kings Tiglath-pileser III and Shalmaneser conquered Galilee and deported its Jewish inhabitants.<sup>21</sup> According to the biblical texts, this allowed the Assyrians to introduce non-Jewish populations to the area, a policy continued even through Hellenistic times when the Ptolemies and Seleucids fought for control over the region. The textual evidence continues in 1 Maccabees 5.9-23.<sup>22</sup> In this passage, the Jews of Galilee are under attack by Gentiles to the extent that Judas and his forces are compelled to flee to Judea, leaving Simon behind to guard the border. While the quantities of Gentile casualties in subsequent battles in 1 Maccabees are likely fictitious,<sup>23</sup> the amount of hostile Gentiles is still great enough to kill approximately a thousand Jews<sup>24</sup> and send the remaining population south to safety.

Another common textual argument for a predominately Gentile Galilee concerns the reign of Aristobulus I, famously known for being the first Hasmonean to take the title of

---

<sup>19</sup> Isaiah 8.23 represents the LXX and MT numbering of the passage. All following references in this thesis will adhere to the LXX and MT designation. For NRSV, shift the verse number forward one position, i.e. LXX/MT Isaiah 8.23 = NRSV Isaiah 9.1, LXX/MT Isaiah 9.1 = NRSV Isaiah 9.2 etc.

<sup>20</sup> Unless otherwise stated, all translations of biblical verses throughout this thesis are my own.

<sup>21</sup> Specifically II Kings 15.29, 17.3-6, 18.11-12, and I Chronicles 5:26; Freyne 1980, 24-26; See also Freyne 2000, 116-118, 177.

<sup>22</sup> See Chancey 2002, 37-40; Freyne 1980, 37; Byrne 2004, 48 uses this verse to implicitly argue for a significant Gentile population in Galilee at the time of Jesus.

<sup>23</sup> Simon’s army inflicts 3000 casualties while Judas’ inflicts 8000, both equal to the size of their respective Jewish armies (I Maccabees 5:22, 34). Chancey 2002, 39-40; see Horsley 1995, 40; Chancey 2005, 35.

<sup>24</sup> I Maccabees 5.13.

*basileus*, and his circa 103 BCE campaign in Galilee. A passage in Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* describes the war, and concludes saying that those conquered were "joined by the bond of circumcision."<sup>25</sup> Scholars such as Emil Schürer explain this passage by asserting that Aristobulus I was Judaizing the population of Galilee.<sup>26</sup> If the population of Galilee needed circumcision, this suggests they were neither ethnically nor religiously Jewish, which is congruent with the arguments previously mentioned concerning Jewish deportations. Finally, there are ample textual references that suggest the region was known as "Galilee of the Gentiles" throughout the centuries. The phrase from Isaiah 8.23 has already been discussed; however, there are numerous others, such as LXX Joel 4.4, 1 Maccabees 5.15, and Matthew 4.15. The last reference will be explored in detail in the second section of this chapter, as it is particularly important to the implications for the population of Galilee during the time of Jesus.

The arguments for a Gentile Galilee presented above are all textually based, either on the Hebrew Bible, LXX, the New Testament, or works such as Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*. However, there are those who point to archaeological evidence to make similar claims. A notable sketch of this evidence can be found in Eric M. Meyers' influential work concerning regionalism in Galilee.<sup>27</sup> Meyers seeks to explore the division of Galilee into upper and lower regions as Josephus and deuterocanonical works suggest.<sup>28</sup> In doing so, Meyers examines archaeological discoveries related to language, ceramics, and architecture to argue that northern and southern Galilee were quite distinct from each other. In collaboration with James F. Strange,<sup>29</sup> Meyers surveys all known extant epigraphic evidence to demonstrate that the language of Lower Galilee

---

<sup>25</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* 13.318.

<sup>26</sup> Freyne 1980, 43 citing Schürer 1890; Freyne 2000, 177-179; See also Chancey 2002, 42.

<sup>27</sup> Meyers 1976; see Deines 2013, 75-77; Cf. Freyne 2000, 12-15; Freyne 1980, 141; Horsley 1996; Horsley 1995, 296-297.

<sup>28</sup> Josephus, *War* 1.22; 3.35-39; Tobit 1.2; Judith 1.7-8.

<sup>29</sup> See Meyers and Strange 1981.

was markedly different from that of Upper Galilee. In comparison to the handful of sites in Upper Galilee reporting Greek inscriptions, 40% of Lower Galilee sites contained Greek epigraphs,<sup>30</sup> allowing the conclusion that “On the basis of epigraphy alone, therefore, Upper Galilee and western Gaulinitis comprise an area of linguistic regionalism in which Hebrew and Aramaic clearly predominate.”<sup>31</sup> Meyers strengthens this sense of distinct regionalism by reporting that certain paradigms in ceramic types are only found in Upper Galilee, though he qualifies this by saying that the examples found have been dated to the Roman and Byzantine periods.<sup>32</sup> The linguistic and ceramic evidence together strongly argues for a significantly more Hellenized Lower Galilee than Upper Galilee. This, combined with Meyers’ admission of a total lack of archaeological evidence for the existence of 1<sup>st</sup> Century CE synagogues,<sup>33</sup> could lead one to conclude that the population of at least Lower Galilee was predominately Greek and not Jewish;<sup>34</sup> Meyer’s work, while open for misinterpretation, shapes the discussion of Galilee Studies even into the present.<sup>35</sup>

This brief overview of the textual and archaeological evidence behind arguments for a Gentile Galilee allows a critical analysis of derived conclusions, and in some instances, the evidence itself. While subsequent archaeological discoveries have weakened the contrast Meyers argued for between Upper and Lower Galilee,<sup>36</sup> his basic premise is correct as demonstrated by the evidence: there was a significant amount of Hellenization occurring in Lower Galilee during the Hellenistic period. Meyers is also correct in incorporating regionalism into the scholarly

---

<sup>30</sup> Meyers 1976, 97.

<sup>31</sup> Meyers 1976, 97.

<sup>32</sup> Meyers 1976, 98.

<sup>33</sup> Meyers 1976, 99; see Meyers 1987 for more recent overview of Galilean synagogue research. See further Chancey 2002, 66. However, some scholars have identified a 2009 site at Magdala as being a synagogue dating from the middle of the 1<sup>st</sup> Century CE. See the Israel Antiquities Authority press release at: [http://www.antiquities.org.il/article\\_Item\\_eng.asp?sec\\_id=25&subj\\_id=240&id=1601&module\\_id=#as](http://www.antiquities.org.il/article_Item_eng.asp?sec_id=25&subj_id=240&id=1601&module_id=#as)

<sup>34</sup> Importantly, Meyers does not come to this conclusion.

<sup>35</sup> See Chancey 2005, 122-165.

<sup>36</sup> See Meyers 1997.

conversation, which will be discussed in regard to Freyne below. However, it is crucial to distinguish the fact that one cannot simply assume that the significant Hellenization Meyers argues for equates to significant paganism.<sup>37</sup> Additionally, Meyers' methodological approach is laudable for its geographic exclusivity with respect to Galilee, compared to other scholars' broader regional scope. In many attempts to discover the cultural identity of Galilee, anything within a few hundred kilometers of Nazareth and several hundred years after Jesus' death informed notions about Galilean language and culture.<sup>38</sup> While there is certainly value in such studies, their broad focus cannot be used to discuss a comparatively small amount of time and space. As Chancey writes, "To understand Galilee, we must give priority to specifically Galilean evidence. Likewise, to understand the first century, we must give priority to first-century evidence."<sup>39</sup> Little has been found from Galilee that can be reliably dated to the 1<sup>st</sup> Century CE; there have been no discoveries of Galilean literature,<sup>40</sup> and the only epigraphic evidence is located on coins,<sup>41</sup> of which only a small set actually date to the life of Jesus.<sup>42</sup> Therefore, when Hellenization is not seen as paganism and archaeological finds are limited geographically and chronologically to the context of Jesus' life, the archaeological evidence for a Gentile Galilee becomes quite sparse.<sup>43</sup> What still remains are the large number of textually-based reasons for assuming a predominantly Gentile population in 1<sup>st</sup> Century CE Galilee.

The earliest of these textual assertions is the prophetic oracle from Isaiah 8.23 which includes *gēlîl haggôyim*, or "Galilee of the Gentiles." Both Freyne and Chancey correctly contest the view that the epithet must designate a major Gentile population in the area around the

---

<sup>37</sup> See Chancey 2002, 7.

<sup>38</sup> See Chancey 2005, 124-133; Horsley 1996, 154-175; Cf. Hengel 1974.

<sup>39</sup> Chancey 2005, 161.

<sup>40</sup> Chancey 2002, 7.

<sup>41</sup> See Chancey 2005, 166-192.

<sup>42</sup> Chancey 2005, 135.

<sup>43</sup> See also Deines 2013, 80-87; Dunn 2003, 298-302.

time of the Assyrian campaign.<sup>44</sup> *Gēlil* and *gēlîlâ* occur 14 times in the MT, and the latter form can often be translated as “border” or “region”.<sup>45</sup> The remaining nine instances of *gēlîl* can be further divided into those which connote circular objects<sup>46</sup> and those which refer to actual territories.<sup>47</sup> In contrast, *gôî*, the indefinite, singular form of *haggôyim*, appears 588 times, 374 of which are translated as “nation” in the KJV. Therefore the phrase can literally be translated as “circle of nations,” and the land may have been called this as a reference to the multiple Canaanite cities that surrounded the region.<sup>48</sup> Further adding to the evidence that Galilee was not known as a predominately Gentile area is the fact that, of all instances of *gēlîl* in the Hebrew Bible, only Isaiah 8.23 pairs it with *haggôyim*.<sup>49</sup> This analysis demonstrates that, at the very least, scholars should not hastily rely on former assumptions about Galilee’s population based off of Isaiah’s title for the region.

A similar argument can be made against the textual reference in LXX Joel 4.4.<sup>50</sup> Just as with Isaiah 8.23, only a superficial reading of the phrase in question, Γαλιλαία ἀλλοφύλων or “foreign Galilee,” could lead one to think of the region as Gentile. Most notably, Γαλιλαία ἀλλοφύλων does not occur in the Hebrew version of the passage. As Chancey argues,<sup>51</sup> the phrase may be an LXX mistranslation of the Hebrew *gēlîlôt pēlāšet*. While *pēlāšet*, or Philistine, is often translated to ἀλλοφύλων in the LXX,<sup>52</sup> Γαλιλαία may be a mistranslation of the plural

---

<sup>44</sup> Freyne 1980, 3, 24-25 and Chancey 2002, 30-34.

<sup>45</sup> Joshua 13.2, 22.10, 22.11; Ezekiel 47.8; Joel 3.4.

<sup>46</sup> 1 Kings 6.34; Esther 1.6; Song of Solomon 5.14.

<sup>47</sup> Joshua 20.7, 21.32; 1 Kings 9.11; 2 Kings 15.29; 1 Chronicles 6.76; Isaiah 8.23.

<sup>48</sup> See Chancey 2002, 170 for a detailed discussion on possible origins of the title.

<sup>49</sup> See Chancey 2002, 31, 170-174; Horsley 288-289. There is a broader issue here of how the LXX translates *gēlîl*, though that is not in the current scope of this argument (see pg.24-25 and fn.109 of this chapter). At present, it suffices to say that the Isaiah 8.23 LXX rendering of *gēlîl haggôyim* into Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν is also a unique construction in the Septuagint.

<sup>50</sup> Joel 3.4 in NRSV.

<sup>51</sup> Chancey 2002, 38.

<sup>52</sup> E.g. 1<sup>st</sup> Samuel 17.8, 17.10, 17.32; See Chancey 2002, 38 fn.58 for an excellent discussion on the suitability of ἀλλοφύλων being translated as Philistine, particularly, “no one has suggested translating Γαλιλαία ἀλλοφύλων in Macc. 5:15 as ‘Galilee of the Philistines.’”

form of *gēlîlâ*, or district, discussed previously. Another possibility Chancey suggests is the translator intentionally archaizing the wording of Joel 4.4 to match Isaiah 8.23's language.<sup>53</sup> While many date Joel to between 400 and 350 BCE,<sup>54</sup> there is at least the possibility it was pre-exilic<sup>55</sup> and therefore would likely not need any such archaizing. Additionally, if the LXX translator of Joel 4.4, who arguably is willing to slightly alter the text to fit his understanding as the translation of *gēlîlôt* to Γαλιλαία, rather than χώρας, γῆς, or ὄρια suggests,<sup>56</sup> wanted to bring the text more in line with the older Isaiah 8.23's Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν, it seems directly quoting Isaiah 8.23's more literal translation would be preferable. As Chancey writes, "At most, LXX Joel 4.4 suggests that at the time of translation, the part of Galilee near the coast was known as Γαλιλαία ἀλλοφύλων."<sup>57</sup>

Galilee in relation to Gentiles does not emerge in the textual sources again until the time of the Maccabean revolt. Once more the Greek phrase Γαλιλαία ἀλλοφύλων appears in the text;<sup>58</sup> however, both Chancey and Horsley caution against taking the title as a representation of the historical or perceived population by the author of 1 Maccabees.<sup>59</sup> Primarily, there are again linguistic issues to consider; however, in the case of Maccabees 5.15, it is not a matter of mistranslation as before but likely an intentional echoing of biblical language.<sup>60</sup> As discussed previously, the LXX often translates *pēlāšet*, "Philistine," as ἀλλοφύλων, "foreigner," which only later comes to mean "Gentile."<sup>61</sup> Throughout the Deuteronomistic history, the Philistines are the greatest enemies of Israel. They triumph over the Israelites and capture the Ark of the

---

<sup>53</sup> Chancey 2002, 38.

<sup>54</sup> See Stephenson 1969.

<sup>55</sup> See Ryssell, 1916, which argues for the very early date of 836-797 BCE or Keller, 2010, which suggests a date of 630-600 BCE.

<sup>56</sup> Symmachus uses ὄρια for example. See Freyne 1980, 384.

<sup>57</sup> Chancey 2002, 38 (my emphasis)

<sup>58</sup> 1 Maccabees 5:15.

<sup>59</sup> See Chancey 2002, 38-45; Horsley 1995, 34-52.

<sup>60</sup> Chancey 2002, 38.

<sup>61</sup> See Acts 10:28.



Covenant at Aphek,<sup>62</sup> and Saul commits suicide after they defeat his army at Mount Gilboa.<sup>63</sup> Yet, in the biblical account it is the future King David who famously kills the hulking Philistine Goliath with a single shot from a sling,<sup>64</sup> and who will go on to triumph over the Philistines once and for all at Rephaim.<sup>65</sup> The Israelite opposition to the Philistines was so well recognized that, after the Bar Kokhba revolt, Rome as an insult replaced Israel's name with the Latin form of "land of the Philistines:" Palestine. As Chancey argues, "this association of the Maccabees' opponents and the Philistines reflects the author's unrelenting hostility to Gentiles and his glorification of the Maccabees."<sup>66</sup> Additionally, the context of 1 Maccabees 5.15 alone should dissuade scholars from claiming a predominantly Gentile population in all of Galilee, as the passage is clearly referencing the *limited* coastal region of Tyre and Sidon, which was heavily Gentile.<sup>67</sup> Therefore, the perceived imbalance of a large Gentile force is expected, as they were dominant in the relevant area. In fact, if the historicity of the account is granted,<sup>68</sup> there must have been some reason the Gentiles of Tyre and Sidon launched an en masse attack against the Jews in Galilee. That they did so would suggest that there was a sufficient population of Jews in the region to constitute a threat should those Jews choose to join the nascent Judean kingdom emerging in the south. Therefore, when considering both the narrative context and biblical background of the use of Γαλιλαία ἄλλοφύλων in 1 Maccabees 5.15, it seems unlikely that the phrase should be taken to accurately reflect the demographics of Galilee at that time.

Those that assumed a overwhelmingly Gentile population in Galilee could point to 2 Kings 15:29, "In the days of King Pekah of Israel, Tiglath-pileser King of Assyria entered and

---

<sup>62</sup> 1 Samuel 4.1-10.

<sup>63</sup> 1 Samuel 31.1-7.

<sup>64</sup> 1 Samuel 17.

<sup>65</sup> 2 Samuel 5.17-25.

<sup>66</sup> Chancey 2002, 39 fn.59 following Schwartz 1991.

<sup>67</sup> See Chancey 2002, 170.

<sup>68</sup> See Horsley 1996, 40, 295 for an argument against such an assumption.

took Ijon, and Abel-beth-maacah, and Janoah, and Kedesh, and Hazor, and Gilead, and Galilee, all the land of Naphtali; and he exiled the people to Assyria.” If the biblical record can be trusted, Galilee is now depopulated, with Samaria receiving the same fate from Tiglath-pileser III’s successor Shalmaneser.<sup>69</sup> The Assyrian conquest and subsequent deportation is additionally supported by Tiglath-pileser III’s Annals.<sup>70</sup> Deportation, the argument is made, occurs so that a land can be repopulated with loyal subjects and its resources used to further the aims of the kingdom in control. The biblical record reflects this in passages such as 2 Kings 17.24-31 and Ezra 4.1-10. Therefore, if the Assyrians seeded Galilee with subjects from their kingdom, i.e. Gentiles, at the end of the 8<sup>th</sup> Century BCE, and these inhabitants were present well into the Persian Era as Ezra suggests, the region must have had a population that was primarily Gentile.

Arguments against understanding 2 Kings 15.29 and 17.24-31 as representing a Gentile population in Galilee as far back as 8<sup>th</sup> Century BCE primarily take one of two approaches. First, some scholars dispute the accuracy of the biblical record altogether. For example, Horsley argues for “the continuity of Israelite population,” where only the skilled laborers and society’s politically and intellectually elite would have been taken back to Assyria; “the bulk of the Israelite population, however, that is, the vast majority of the peasantry, would have been left on the land.”<sup>71</sup> Horsley goes on to hedge his theory by arguing that it may not even have been Israelites who were deported, but Syrians who might have been in Galilee after invading the region during the Assyrian campaign, adding, “there is no reason to think that the Syrians any more than the Assyrians or Babylonians would have deported the Galilean villagers.”<sup>72</sup> The second approach takes the deportation and immigration accounts as at least somewhat

---

<sup>69</sup> 2 Kings 17.3-6, 18.11-12, 1 Chronicles 5.26.

<sup>70</sup> “Fragmentary Annalistic Text,” translated by A. Leo Oppenheim (ANET 265).

<sup>71</sup> Horsley 1995, 27. Note that Freyne held this position in *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian* prior to the work of Zvi Gal. See Freyne 1980, 25 contrasted with Freyne’s revised position presented in Freyne 1997, 371.

<sup>72</sup> Horsley 1995, 27.

historically accurate. Under this method, Freyne highlights the discrepancy in pro-Gentile-Galilee scholars' arguments.<sup>73</sup> Yes, Assyrians deported Jews from Galilee between 740 and 722 BCE; and yes, they also imported Gentiles into Israel. However, all of the passages that reference that emigration specifically limit themselves to Samaria.<sup>74</sup> Freyne, echoing Meyers' attention to distinct regionalism, emphasizes that Galilee and Samaria were different regions and were handled differently by the Assyrians, mirroring biblical and historical records. The Assyrians established a vassal state in Judea and Samaria ruled by Hoshea, who would go on to revolt against his new rulers and thus receive a devastating defeat at their hands. Punishment for the revolt included not only deportations from Samaria, but also the settling of different populations in the area.<sup>75</sup> As Freyne argues, it is incorrect to assume that the policies enacted in Samaria were also performed in Galilee, especially considering that the Assyrians saw Samaria as a greater threat.<sup>76</sup>

In an attempt to determine the validity of the biblical and Assyrian textual records, Zvi Gal conducted archaeological surveys and excavations at numerous sites in Galilee. Strikingly, Gal found very little material that could be dated to the time between the late 8<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Centuries BCE, especially when compared to the periods before and after.<sup>77</sup> Gal found evidence for a growing population beginning in the 13<sup>th</sup> and peaking in the 10<sup>th</sup> Century BCE, yet what he refers to as a "gap" occurs in the archaeological material after the Assyrian campaign and before the return of the Israelites during the Persian era.<sup>78</sup> Gal's work corroborates both the textual accounts and Freyne's stress on the distinct difference between Samaria and Galilee. Not only

---

<sup>73</sup> Freyne 1980, 25.

<sup>74</sup> See 2 Kings 17.24-31 and Ezra 4.1-10.

<sup>75</sup> 2 Kings 17.

<sup>76</sup> Freyne 1980, 24-26.

<sup>77</sup> Gal 1992; Gal 1998.

<sup>78</sup> Gal 1998, 51.

did the region lack a Jewish population, it also lacked a Gentile one.<sup>79</sup> Therefore, even after the deportations, Galilee could not be said to have a major Gentile population.

The final meaningful argument for a Gentile Galilee concerns Aristobulus I's campaign in the region and holds particular significance, as it is chronologically the closest possible attestation about the population of Galilee to the life of Jesus. As discussed above, the account is found in *Jewish Antiquities* wherein Josephus, with frustrating brevity, recounts Aristobulus I forcing circumcision on those who wished to remain in Galilee.<sup>80</sup> Again, if Galilee's inhabitants required circumcision, they could not be religiously or ethnically Jewish, and therefore the Galilee of Jesus' time could at best be called Jewish in name only (if even that!), not in spirit.<sup>81</sup> Thus, the question must be: who was in Galilee to be forcibly circumcised? As Gal postulates, archaeological evidence demonstrates that the region was barely inhabited by Jewish Israelites or Gentile Assyrians after the 8<sup>th</sup> Century BCE, and therefore their descendants who lived during Aristobulus I's reign were likely relatively few in number. Yet, Josephus' account does mention a group in Galilee that fell under Aristobulus I's influence: the Itureans.<sup>82</sup> However, as Horsley argues, Iturean sources suggest that the Arab tribe was based north of Galilee in Lebanon, and while the Itureans controlled parts of Galilee, they never settled there.<sup>83</sup> Therefore, Josephus can be seen as correcting his source, Timagenes through Strabo: Aristobulus I did not conquer the Itureans themselves, but took over control of Galilee and those living in it. Chancey offers a more convincing argument, though not necessarily contradictory to Horsley's, by highlighting the Semitic origin of the Itureans, which may mean circumcision was already a common or

---

<sup>79</sup> See Chancey 2002, 28-34.

<sup>80</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* 13.

<sup>81</sup> Chancey 2002, 42-43.

<sup>82</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* 13.318-319.

<sup>83</sup> Horsley 1995, 41; see also Chancey 2002, 44; Chancey 2005, 36-37.

required practice among them.<sup>84</sup> Coupled with Josephus' brevity on the subject suggesting that any conflict was likely quite minor, and a lack of archaeological evidence indicating a major struggle between Aristobulus I and the Itureans,<sup>85</sup> Chancey's argument becomes even more attractive.<sup>86</sup> Therefore, those who remained in Galilee, Iturean or otherwise, likely submitted themselves to Hasmonean, *Jewish* rule without much, or any, conflict. The recovery of increasingly more Hasmonean coins and absence of earlier Seleucid and Phoenician currency at Galilean sites dating to the latter part of the Hasmoneans' reign suggest that Galilee saw an influx of Jewish immigrants that would continue through the early Roman period, thus establishing a Jewish population in the region at the time of Jesus' birth.<sup>87</sup>

After an analysis of the textual and archaeological rationale for a Gentile Galilee demonstrates the insubstantiality of such claims, those who wish to defend the notion of a predominately Gentile-populated Galilee are left only with outdated assumptions. While the scholars discussed above do not always agree with each other, they clearly show that these long-held conjectures are no longer tenable. Yet, there is one reference to a Gentile Galilee not yet discussed: Matthew 4.15. If Galilee was in fact Jewish at the time of Jesus, why is Matthew comfortable calling it "Galilee of the Gentiles" in his Gospel?

### **Matthew in Light of a Jewish Galilee**

The overview of scholarship above presents strong evidence for the Jewish demography of Galilee at the time of Matthew's authorship. This analysis necessarily influences the interpretation of Matthew 4:15-16: "Land of Zebulon, land of Naphtali, the way by the sea,

---

<sup>84</sup> Chancey 2002, 44.

<sup>85</sup> Chancey 2005, 36-37.

<sup>86</sup> See Chancey 2002, 43-45; Freyne 1980, 41-43.

<sup>87</sup> Chancey 2002, 47.

across the Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles – the people who sat in darkness saw a great light and for those who sat in the region and shadow of death light rose on them,” drawn from Isaiah 8:23-9:1. In order to explore what the evangelist may imply about 1<sup>st</sup> Century CE Galilean demographics, both Matthew’s approach to scriptural quotations throughout the Gospel as well as his appropriation of this particular piece of Scripture must be analyzed.

While Matthew’s use of Scripture is not unique among the Synoptics, his heavy dependence on a fulfillment formula is.<sup>88</sup> The evangelist cites the Scriptures 10 to 14 times, eight of which are from Isaiah,<sup>89</sup> and these formula citations are often accompanied by slight variations of “all this happened in order that what had been spoken by the Lord through the prophet may be fulfilled...”<sup>90</sup> For Matthew, the prophet is an implement of God, an agent through which the ultimate author of Scripture is able to speak.<sup>91</sup> As will be discussed in detail in regards to 4.15-16, the evangelist’s quotations often vary slightly from either or both the LXX and MT, which have led some scholars to argue for their origin in an oral tradition<sup>92</sup> or that Matthew possessed now non-extant versions or revisions of the LXX which differ in wording from those that remain today.<sup>93</sup> Similarly, the function of these scriptural quotations is debated. Some have seen their significance only insofar as they verify “the historical biographical facticity” of Jesus’ life,<sup>94</sup> and while some of the quotations, such as the two colts in 21.5 or the thirty pieces of silver in 27.9, could seem mundane, this is likely too limited of a scope for

---

<sup>88</sup> Possible others may include Luke 18:31, 22:37, 24:44 and Mark 15:28; however, only Matthew’s use of the formula is distinctive and consistently employed throughout the Gospel.

<sup>89</sup> Brown 1996, 207; Byrne 2004, 11; Evans 2011, 103; Luz argues, “No other prophetic scroll [except Isaiah] can be assumed to have been in the Matthean community library.” Luz 1992, 157.

<sup>90</sup> Matthew 1:22.

<sup>91</sup> This idea is likely not unique to Matthew. “διὰ τῶν προφητῶν” is also present in Luke 18.31, Acts 2.16, 28.15, and Romans 1.2.

<sup>92</sup> See Kilpatrick 1946, 56-58.

<sup>93</sup> See Menken 2004, 32, wherein Menken argues that Matthew is working from an LXX that was revised specifically to more closely represent the Hebrew text; see also Kahle 1959, 238.

<sup>94</sup> Luz 1992, 161 citing Strecker 1962, 85.

addressing the passages as a whole. Lindars emphasizes their apologetic nature, though goes on to frame them in the Jewish polemic found in the Gospel. That is, the quotations were used to vindicate (Jewish) Christianity over and against (other forms of) Judaism.<sup>95</sup> Nuances aside, what can be certain is that Matthew is using these passages to make a theological claim that the events surrounding Jesus during his lifetime were in accordance with God's plan. As Luz writes, "[The quotations] are only the expression, intensified and made foundational, of a conviction which all early Christianity shares: the Christ event is the fulfillment of Scripture...Only the Old Testament makes it possible that the risen Jesus can be proclaimed and understood."<sup>96</sup>

How Matthew uses these quotations in the development and structuring of his narrative is also significant. A brief overview of some of his scriptural quotations will demonstrate that the evangelist is interested in these pieces of Scripture primarily as a means to tell and theologically substantiate his story. For example, Matthew's infancy narrative holds the greatest number of these quotations, beginning with Matthew 1.23, "Look, the virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and they will call his name Emmanuel, which is translated, 'God is with us.'" In order to emphasize the significance and prophesized inevitability of Jesus' birth, Matthew draws on the LXX version of Isaiah 7.14, shaping how the evangelist tells the story in the surrounding verses.<sup>97</sup> More importantly, the quotation's use "implicitly identifies and vindicates the church as the continuation of Israel; for if Jesus, whom the church confesses, has fulfilled the Scriptures, then Christians must be the true people of God."<sup>98</sup> While the quotation is apologetically ideal, it fails to take into account a historical understanding of Isaiah 7.14. On one hand, in its use of *παρθένος*, the LXX could very well intend to imply that the woman in question is currently a

---

<sup>95</sup> Lindars 1961, 48; see also Davies and Allison 1988, 213.

<sup>96</sup> Luz 1992, 163.

<sup>97</sup> Matthew 1.18-25.

<sup>98</sup> Davies and Allison 1988, 213.

virgin but will not remain so in order to bear a son.<sup>99</sup> Most importantly, Matthew does not show much concern for the verse in its original, historical context. That is, Matthew's use demonstrates his interest in shaping the Jesus narrative as one that extends before his Gospel and is an indistinguishable part of a rich tradition of God's actions in history. By using the Scriptures in this way, the evangelist must often sacrifice the limited meaning of the text at the time it was written. For example, Isaiah 7.14 was initially addressed to King Ahaz and likely meant to foretell God's intervention in the current Assyrian oppression, possibly foretelling the coming birth of Hezekiah. Moreover, there is little or no evidence of any Jewish messianic understanding that included a virgin birth;<sup>100</sup> thus, Matthew can be seen to overlook a strictly literal interpretation of the text in favor of a broader theological context. The same method can be seen in Matthew 2.15, "and [they] were there until the death of Herod in order that what had been spoken by the Lord through the prophet may be fulfilled, 'Out of Egypt I called my son.'" While there is precedent for understanding a redemption of Israel motif to be applied to a redeeming messiah,<sup>101</sup> there can be no doubt that Hosea 11.1, the Scripture which Matthew is referencing, is clearly concerned with the nation of Israel during the Exodus, some 1200 years before the birth of Jesus: "When Israel was a child, I loved him, and out of Egypt I called my son." Therefore, while the evangelist uses these scriptural quotations to construct a theologically-charged, and sometimes unique, narrative that makes connections between God's past and present actions, he does so at the expense of their literary or original context, except in that they possess inherent value derived from their place among the Scriptures of Israel.<sup>102</sup>

---

<sup>99</sup> E.g. LXX Gen 34.3; see Evans 2012, 41-42; Davies and Allison 1988, 212-214; Luz 1992, 122.

<sup>100</sup> Beaton 2002, 91. Beaton uses firmer language, "there is no evidence," however both Davies and Allison, 1988 213, and Luz, 1992 123-124, caution that this motif *may* have been associated with Hezekiah, though they likely would agree with the softened statement presented here.

<sup>101</sup> Davies and Allison 1988, 263.

<sup>102</sup> See Brown 1996, 207.



This analysis of how Matthew broadly uses quotations from the Scriptures has important implications for 4.15-16. The citation is not a verbatim copy of the LXX version of Isaiah 8.23b-9.1. On the contrary, there are a number of syntactical choices the evangelist makes which suggest that he is either aware of both Hebrew and Greek versions of the text or that he is aware of both the LXX and another Greek version that has been conformed to the Hebrew.<sup>103</sup>

Matthew 4.15-16	LXX Isaiah 8.23-9.1	MT Isaiah 9.1-2
γῆ Ζαβουλὼν καὶ γῆ Νεφθαλίμ	χώρα Ζαβουλων ἡ γῆ Νεφθαλιμ	<i>'ereṣ zēbulûn wē'ereṣ naptālî</i>
ὁδὸν θαλάσσης	ὁδὸν θαλάσσης <sup>104</sup> καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ τὴν παραλίαν κατοικοῦντες	<i>wēhā'ahārôn hikkîd derek hayyām</i>
πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν,	καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν, τὰ μέρη τῆς Ἰουδαίας.	<i>'ēber hayyardēn gēlîl haggōyim</i>
ὁ λαὸς ὁ καθημένος ἐν σκότει φῶς εἶδεν μέγα, καὶ τοῖς καθημένοις ἐν χώρᾳ καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου φῶς ἀνέτειλεν αὐτοῖς.	ὁ λαὸς ὁ πορευόμενος ἐν σκότει, ἴδετε φῶς μέγα οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν χώρᾳ καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου, φῶς λάμψει ἐφ' ὑμᾶς.	<i>Hā'ām hahōlkîm bahōšek rā'û 'ôr gādōl Yōšēbē bē'ereṣ šalmāwet 'ôr nāggah 'ālêhem</i>

For example, Matthew's translation of "land of Zebulon and land of Naphtali" mirrors the Hebrew rendering, which includes the conjunctive *waw* and doubled *'ereṣ* unlike the LXX's

<sup>103</sup> It should be noted that Menken argues in Menken 2004, 22-33 that Matthew is likely working solely from a revised LXX that is closer to the Hebrew text, though one that at least in some places depends on the non-revised LXX presented below. Therefore, Matthew is not responsible for most of the redactions that will be highlighted in the argument presented by this chapter. However, Menken does believe the revised LXX Matthew is working from has a longer version of Isaiah 8.23, like the non-revised LXX, and Matthew has chosen to shorten it for 4.15-16. If this is the case, it still demonstrates what the present argument will contend: that Matthew is willing to alter Scripture in order to fit the context he desires. The implications of this will be discussed at a later point in the chapter. Cf. France 2007, 470 fn.17 for an argument against Menken's conclusions.

<sup>104</sup> See Beaton 2002, 98 fn.47 and 100 fn. 58 for a discussion on the "considerable doubt" about ὁδὸν θαλάσσης existing in the original LXX. In short, Beaton, following Davies, suggests καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ τὴν παραλίαν κατοικοῦντες is likely the original LXX's rendering of *wēhā'ahārôn hikkîd derek hayyām*, and ὁδὸν θαλάσσης is a later addition attempting to bring the Greek closer to the Hebrew version. This could suggest another point of connection between the Matthean and Hebrew versions of the text.

deletion of the *waw* and use of the synonyms χώρα and γῆ. Yet, Matthew does not always follow the MT, as his spelling of Νεφθαλίμ is likely dependent on the LXX or another non-extant Greek version. While BDB offers Νεφθαλι + μ as a Greek variant spelling, its rarity of use makes it unlikely Matthew and the LXX independently chose to spell the region's name in the same way.<sup>105</sup> Furthermore, the Matthean text follows both the LXX and MT at different points in regard to omissions. Both Matthew and the LXX exclude *wēhā'ahārôn hikkîd*<sup>106</sup> while the evangelist, in line with the Hebrew text, does not include the LXX's καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ τὴν παραλίαν κατοικοῦντες nor τὰ μέρη τῆς Ιουδαίας. The exclusion of καί before πέραν τοῦ Ιορδάνου in Matthew, as well as his rendering of εἶδεν as an indicative verb reflecting the Hebrew text's same treatment of *rā'û* against the LXX's imperative ἴδετε,<sup>107</sup> further suggest Matthew's dependence on the Hebrew text. However, of particular importance is the agreement between Matthew and the LXX in regards to Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν. As discussed previously, *gēlîl haggôyim* can simply mean "circle/region of the nations." Other Greek instances of this phrase, such as Aquila's "θίνας τῶν ἐθνῶν" and Symmachus' "ὄριον τῶν ἐθνῶν"<sup>108</sup> demonstrate more literal translations, a practice that Matthew typically favors according to the evidence cited above, making his deviation in this particular instance noteworthy.<sup>109</sup> If Matthew were drawing

---

<sup>105</sup> Of the 32 occurrences of *naptālî*, none of which occur with a final *mem*, in the MT, only four are spelled with a final μ in the LXX.

Νεφθαλι: Genesis 30.8, 35.25, 46.24, 49.21; Numbers 1.42, 2.29, 10.27, 34.2; Deuteronomy 33.23, 34.2; Joshua 19.39, 20.70; Judges 1.33, 4.6(x2), 4.10, 6.35, 7.23; 1 Kings 4.15, 7.14, 15.20; 2 Kings 15.29; 1 Chronicles 2.2, 12.41; 2 Chronicles 16.4, 34.36; Ezekiel 48.4.

Νεφθαλιμ: Judges 5.18; Isaiah 8.23; Ezekiel 48.3, 48.34.

Additionally, Josephus offers Νεφθαλις (Josephus, *Ant.* 2.181) and Νεφθαλεις (Josephus, *Ant.* 1.305) as alternate spellings.

<sup>106</sup> See fn.93.

<sup>107</sup> εἶδεν – aorist, active, indicative, 3<sup>rd</sup> person, singular

*rā'û* – qal, perfect, 3<sup>rd</sup> person, common, plural

ἴδετε – aorist, active, 2<sup>nd</sup> person, imperative

<sup>108</sup> Beaton 2002, 100.

<sup>109</sup> In all but one case, the LXX translates *gēlîl* as a proper noun (Joshua 13.2). The suitability of such a practice does not add to this discussion, as it is Matthew's use of Γαλιλαία that is important. Again, Matthew may be quoting the LXX, offering his own translation of a Hebrew text, or working from a revised Greek version that is closer to the

on an older, now lost version of the LXX which more closely resembled the Hebrew text, many of the alterations just explored could no longer be seen as the evangelist actively modifying the passage. However, Matthew's spelling of Νεφθαλι with a final μ and especially his following the LXX in translating *gēlil* as Γαλιλαία rather than θίνας or ὄριον, suggest he is aware of a Greek version that at least more closely resembles what we have today than one more in line with the Hebrew text.<sup>110</sup> Therefore, this analysis of 4.15-16 indicates that Matthew is willing to employ a measure of authorial license in order to mildly alter the received text when drawing on Scripture. This willingness to change the text may very well derive from his preference for a given text's ability to support and further his theological narrative over the Scripture's literal or historical context as demonstrated above.

Before moving on to an examination of what Matthew gains by quoting Isaiah 8.23, it is useful to survey the way that interpreters have historically understood his use of this particular passage. Any interpretation of Matthew 4.15-16 must consider the conclusions discussed above, yet those who have argued for a predominantly Gentile Galilee at the time of Jesus have generally felt free to disregard these concerns. Alongside Gentile women in the genealogy (1.3-6), the pilgrimage of Gentile magi at Jesus' birth (2.1-12), and most notably the Great Commission (28.16-20), 4.15-16 has been used to further argue a pro-Gentile agenda on behalf of the evangelist.<sup>111</sup> Under this paradigm, some have argued that "those who sit in darkness" in 4.16 are the Gentiles that dwell in Galilee.<sup>112</sup> This fits well with the superficial reading of the passage: if Galilee is "Galilee of the Gentiles," then those in Galilee must be Gentiles!

---

Hebrew text; however, all that is intended to be shown here is that Matthew had other options, such as θίνας and ὄριον, when using Γαλιλαία.

<sup>110</sup> Cf. Menken 2004, 22-33; again, Menken contends that Matthew is relying on a revised LXX that has already made these specific changes because of a dependency on a non-revised LXX. And again, even if this is the case, Menken and I come to the same conclusion, that Matthew is willing to alter the text of Scripture, which is the crux of the present argument.

<sup>111</sup> See France 1998, 232-235; Kingsbury 1988, 151; Matera 1986, 137-139.

<sup>112</sup> See Byrne 2004, 47.

Regardless of how one should understand “Galilee of the Gentiles,” taking ὁ λαός in v.16 to be a reference to Gentiles is questionable exegesis that overlooks how Matthew and the LXX consistently use the term.<sup>113</sup> The *Jewish* chief priests and scribes/elders τοῦ λαοῦ are mentioned in connection with synagogues,<sup>114</sup> the Temple,<sup>115</sup> and the courtyard of the high priest;<sup>116</sup> those plotting against Jesus are worried about an uproar among τῷ λαῷ, who are in Jerusalem for a *Jewish* festival, Passover; infamously, it is all ὁ λαός who yell, “his blood be on us and on our children” in 27.25. The same is true in all LXX quotations in the Gospel; every ὁ λαός is a reference to the *Jewish* people of Israel.<sup>117</sup> Matthew, in fact, has a word for Gentiles: τὰ ἔθνη, and uses it throughout the Gospel to refer to non-Jewish populations.<sup>118</sup> If Matthew wanted to identify the people mentioned in 4.16 as Gentile, his willingness to depart from both the LXX and MT as shown above would have allowed him to replace ὁ λαός with τὰ ἔθνη. Therefore, all one is left with to identify Galilee as Gentile is the Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν from 4.15.

Some have argued that Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν is indicative of the author’s lack of care for the region.<sup>119</sup> While the scope of this chapter limits present discussion to Galilee as it relates to 4.15-16, it is fair to say that Matthew does not place the same emphasis on the area as the other evangelists.<sup>120</sup> However, that does not mean the region was insignificant enough for the author to carelessly misrepresent its population. It is in Galilee that Jesus begins his ministry, from a Galilean mountaintop that he gives one of the most influential speeches in history, and through Galilean disciples that his message spreads to all the nations.<sup>121</sup> In fact, Matthew’s use of Isaiah

---

<sup>113</sup> See Luz 1992, 105; Davies and Allison 1988, 210, 415-416.

<sup>114</sup> Matthew 2.4, 4.23, 9.35.

<sup>115</sup> Matthew 21.23.

<sup>116</sup> Matthew 26.3.

<sup>117</sup> Matthew 2.6, 13.15, 15.8.

<sup>118</sup> Matthew 6.32, 10.5, 10.18, 12.18, 12.21, 20.19, 20.25, 21.43, 24.7, 24.9, 24.14, 25.32, 28.19.

<sup>119</sup> See Beaton 2002, 102.

<sup>120</sup> See Freyne 1980, 360-364; see also Chapters 2-4 of this thesis.

<sup>121</sup> Matthew 4.12, 5.1-7.29, 28.16-20; see also Freyne 1988, 70-90.

8.23 in 4.15-16 is evidence of Galilee’s significance in the Gospel. As discussed before, the evangelist’s first concern for a scriptural quotation is its ability to theologically support the narrative he is writing. In this way, 4.15-16 is entirely consistent with the three prior geographical referents concerning Jesus legitimated by Scripture.<sup>122</sup> As demonstrated, Matthew does not trouble himself with the original contexts of these Scriptures,<sup>123</sup> and therefore, “Galilee of the Gentiles” is no more reflective of historical reality than the virgin birth or Jesus’ flight to Egypt.<sup>124</sup> “There was no literal sense in which Galilee was for Jesus Gentile territory. But that matters not for the evangelist since his interest is wholly theological.”<sup>125</sup> In quoting Isaiah 8.23, Matthew is able to both foreshadow the Great Commission, and thus link a scriptural text with the Gentiles’ inclusion in the church, and elevate Galilee to the center of a scripturally-ordained messianic ministry.<sup>126</sup> It is this, and not any concern for historical accuracy, that underpins Matthew’s application of this passage.

With the evidence presented above, Matthew should not be seen as using “Galilee of the Gentiles” to make any claims about demographics in the region. As Chancey writes, “The phrase... appearing only once in a first-century CE source, and that a quotation from an eighth-century BCE source, tells us nothing about the region’s population in the Roman period,” and that Matthew’s use of “Galilee of the Gentiles” speaks more about his idiosyncratic ideology than the situation on the ground.<sup>127</sup> The scriptural quotation, like many others in the Gospel, only serves to further his story with strong theological support. Thus, nothing remains to identify Galilee as Gentile, and the story of a Jewish Galilee that archaeology is presently uncovering

---

<sup>122</sup> Matthew 2.5-6 – Bethlehem / 2.15 – Egypt / 2.23 – Nazareth.

<sup>123</sup> And, as demonstrated above during the discussion on Isaiah 8.23 in Section 1, the original context of *gēlīl haggōyim* / Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν should not imply a Gentile Galilee either.

<sup>124</sup> See Davies and Allison 1988, 221.

<sup>125</sup> Davies and Allison 1988, 385.

<sup>126</sup> See Freyne 1988, 77.

<sup>127</sup> Chancey 2002, 173-174.

should be accepted above past notions, namely, the same story of a Jewish Galilee that the next chapter of this thesis will show has been hiding in plain sight since the authorship of Mark.

## CHAPTER TWO

### **GALILEE AND THE GENTILES: GALILEE AND FOREIGN LANDS IN THE GOSPEL OF MARK**

Chapter One examined the roots of past scholarship that led many to believe Galilee was predominately populated by Gentiles. The argument of the previous chapter engaged primarily with the archaeological and textual evidence suggesting a heavily Gentile Galilean population in order to refute such conclusions. However, this chapter will approach the issue from a related, yet different, position by exploring the evidence found *within* the Jesus Tradition that indicates a largely Jewish 1<sup>st</sup> Century CE Galilee. The Gospel of Mark and the locations presented in it will serve as a case study for this endeavor.

The topic of space in the Gospel of Mark has been a primary concern of scholarship over the last century, and has been approached with a diverse set of methodologies. Some, such as Sean Freyne, have chosen to focus primarily on the historical geography found in the narrative, while others have adopted a theological method to explain why the evangelist presents the locations he does. Regardless of the approach taken, the strong division between Galilee and Jerusalem is an inescapable aspect of the study of locality in Mark. This is increasingly apparent in an exploration of scholars' attempts to outline the Gospel. In their commentaries, both Eugene Boring and John Donahue reference many previous authors who adopted the 'Galilee to Jerusalem' narrative structure of Mark.<sup>128</sup> Morna Hooker writes in her commentary, "any attempt to analyze [the structure of] the Gospel is bound to be arbitrary, since we are putting our own pattern on the material," yet in the proceeding sentences she too clearly structures the Gospel

---

<sup>128</sup> Boring 2006, 4; Donahue and Harrington 2002, 46-47.

around the Galilee to Jerusalem paradigm.<sup>129</sup> While the contrast between these two locations is important for comprehending the purpose of Mark's Gospel,<sup>130</sup> the intense focus on this narrative-spanning journey can be detrimental to the study of other locations and their significance. Contrary to the often-primary focus of Galilee to Jerusalem, this chapter will argue that an understanding of the relationship between Galilee and foreign lands in Mark is a necessary element of recognizing the evangelist's purposes. An analysis of this relationship not only demonstrates the significance of Galilee in the narrative, but also shows the Gospel's clear concern for Judaism and its relevance in that region.

### **The Geopolitical Sequence of the Gospel of Mark**

An overview of the geopolitical sequence in Mark is necessary to establish the existence of a more geographically sophisticated structure underlying the narrative than simply Jesus' journey from Galilee to Jerusalem. The Gospel opens at the river Jordan with "the whole Judean country and all the Jerusalemites" coming out into the wilderness to be baptized by John. In contrast, Jesus enters the Gospel's narrative the same way he leaves it: alone, the sole traveler from Galilee. While many are quick to assert that the allusions to and use of Scripture in the prologue signal the great importance of the coming narrative, the juxtaposition Mark creates between a single Galilean and the multitude from Judea should not be exempt from such stage dressing, and is the first indication to the reader that location throughout the Gospel will play a significant role. Many commentators gloss over this contrast with an air of indifference, either disregarding the subject entirely<sup>131</sup> or relegating it to solely a method for identifying Jesus as

---

<sup>129</sup> Hooker 1991, 16.

<sup>130</sup> See Roskam 2004.

<sup>131</sup> Marcus 2005; Hurtado 1989.



from an otherwise unimportant region.<sup>132</sup> For example, Ched Myers contends that mentioning “Nazareth” is “tantamount to announcing [Jesus] as ‘Jesus from Nowheresville.’”<sup>133</sup> Both R.T. France and Boring recognize the striking nature of the dichotomy, and while they correctly go on to highlight the subsequent tension created between Galilee and Jerusalem and Judea, both frame their discussions around Jesus’ death in Jerusalem, saying little about the elevation of Galilee to a place of prominence.<sup>134</sup> The evangelist’s choice to give Jesus the epithet “from Nazareth of Galilee,” rather than a traditionally christological title, further signals that the region holds great significance for the coming narrative.

After his baptism, Jesus returns to Galilee, where he inaugurates his ministry by announcing the kingdom of God’s arrival, proclaiming the Gospel, and calling the disciples. The remainder of Chapter One sets the foundation for the Galilean ministry, with Jesus performing prototypical actions, i.e. teaching and preaching in the synagogues (1.21, 39), exorcising demons (1.24, 39), and healing the sick (1.40-42). After healing a man with an unclean spirit, Jesus’ fame spreads throughout all of Galilee as the sick and demon-oppressed flock to him. This culminates at the beginning of Chapter Two, when Jesus returns to his house in Capernaum. A great crowd has gathered that will follow him through the Gospel narrative.

It is not difficult to assume that this repeatedly amazed crowd, which obstructs the path of paralytics and is mentioned no less than five times in the first 15 verses of Chapter Two, could begin to become overwhelming. Therefore, it comes as no surprise that Jesus and the disciples withdraw to the Sea of Galilee at the beginning of Chapter Three, quite possibly intending to

---

<sup>132</sup> Moloney 2002, 36.

<sup>133</sup> Myers 2008, 128.

<sup>134</sup> France 2002, 75-76; Boring 2006, 44-45.

escape those that have been following them.<sup>135</sup> Yet there to meet them waits an even larger crowd from Galilee, Judea, Jerusalem, Idumea, from beyond the Jordan, and from around Tyre and Sidon. Historically, it is plausible that, upon hearing about Jesus and the mighty works he was performing throughout Galilee, many people from the surrounding regions came to personally encounter him. However, the significance does not lie in the historicity of the occasion these verses portray, but in the geographic scope of Jesus' ministry.<sup>136</sup> The evangelist develops the importance of these locations in two primary ways. First, the diversity of the crowd foreshadows Jesus' travels later in the narrative, as he will visit each of these locations, except for Idumea, before his death. Second, and more importantly, the places mentioned could easily be substituted with the cardinal directions. Tyre and Sidon represent the north; Idumea, Judea, and Jerusalem the south; Galilee the west; and beyond the Jordan the east. Placing Galilee at the beginning of this list may not be accidental. While modern readers would expect a north-south-east-west sequence, wherein Galilee could be grouped with Tyre and Sidon to represent the north, those contemporary with Mark most often employed a cardinal progression beginning in the east.<sup>137</sup> Therefore, bringing Galilee, the western region in this collection, to the foremost position in the series is a further indication of the area's significance.

The geopolitical sequence continues after the parables chapter, with Jesus and the disciples' journey to foreign lands beginning with the country of the Gerasenes in 5.1. After their return in v.21, the disciples are commanded to go to Bethsaida in 6.45; however, the trip is postponed for stops in Tyre and Sidon (7.24, 31) and the Decapolis (7.31), after which Bethsaida is reached (8.22) and the party moves on to Caesarea Philippi (8.27). Galilee is still featured

---

<sup>135</sup> Especially if the nuance of ἀναχωρέω should be read as “to withdraw from battle” as it is in Attic Greek; additionally Matthew 2.12, 13, 14, 22 and John 6.15 all seem to fit this convention.

<sup>136</sup> Cf. Schröter 2013, 125-130.

<sup>137</sup> Drinkard 1992, 257.

heavily throughout this section of the Gospel. With return trips to the region in 6.53 (Gennesaret), 8.10 (Dalmanutha), and 9.33 (Capernaum), the reader is meant to see Jesus' traveling to these foreign lands within the context of the Galilean ministry.

A number of scholars, especially those prone to redaction criticism, have highlighted this section to make increasingly negative statements about Mark's handling of historical material. Some regard Jesus' travel to foreign lands as the evangelist's anachronistic attempt to understand the present reality of Gentile participation in the church with an origin in the ministry of Jesus.<sup>138</sup> There are those who go further, asserting Mark is either confused about the geography surrounding Galilee or is carelessly tying stories together without contemplating the so-called strained geographic aspect of the narrative.<sup>139</sup> If this were true, it could suggest there is no significance to be found in an analysis of the geography of Chapters Five through Nine, as it would then be solely a creation of a geographically clumsy author; such critics assume something must be wrong with the account that has survived.

These critics do have legitimate arguments, which are necessary to address as they undermine Mark's ability to create meaning and significance with his geopolitical structure. For example, a common reason for the conclusion that Mark is mishandling geography is his designation of the land Jesus travels to on the eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee in 5.1 as “τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασηνῶν.” This poses an apparent problem because the land of Gerasa did not border a body of water, but was considerably inland to the east.<sup>140</sup> Yet, a number of possible solutions exist that would exonerate Mark from being geographically inept. Schmeller contends

---

<sup>138</sup> Theissen puts it eloquently by saying, “Jesus’ long detour over Sidon and the Decapolis in Mark 7.31 would have led him into the neighborhood of Markan Christianity. – Theissen 1991, 244. Furthermore, this chapter is not attempting to engage with the debate of whether or not the Gospel of Mark portrays Jesus as actively seeking out Gentiles as part of a larger “Gentile mission.” It seems sufficient to note that whatever Jesus’ aims are, Mark has him encounter Gentiles in Gentile lands, a position that will be argued at a later point in this chapter. See further fn. 37. See further Schröter 2013, 125 for an argument against this approach.

<sup>139</sup> See Keck 1965, 341-342.

<sup>140</sup> See McRay 2008.

that Mark may use the phrase “land of the Gerasenes” to refer to the region of the Decapolis as a whole.<sup>141</sup> More convincingly, Schröter, comparing Mark’s language in 5.1 with “ὅλην τὴν χώραν” describing the land of Gennesaret in 6.55, argues that Mark’s use of “χώρα” here is substantive rather than stylistic, indicating a geographical nuance between generic region and specific location.<sup>142</sup> Schröter’s claim is strengthened by Mark’s use of a different noun, “ὄριον” when describing Tyre as a defined place, as opposed to broad territory, in 7.31.

Perhaps the most incriminating alleged problem with Mark’s use of geography stems from this very verse when Jesus “came out of the region of Tyre [and] went through Sidon to the Sea of Galilee, in the midst of the region of the Decapolis.” Critics of Mark’s representation of geography primarily focus on two details of this route. First, many comment on Sidon’s position north of Tyre, i.e. far out of the out-of-the-way if Jesus were traveling to the eastern side of the Sea of Galilee. Yet every occurrence of “Tyre” and “Sidon” appearing together in the New Testament has “καὶ Σιδῶνος” proceed immediately after “Τύρος” except here in Mark 7.31.<sup>143</sup> Mark’s inclusion of “ἦλθεν διὰ” instead of the otherwise standard “καὶ” indicates that the evangelist is consciously deviating from the norm in his presentation of this event. Many scholars create “absurd” travel routes to serve as modern-day analogies to the path Mark claims Jesus took,<sup>144</sup> yet because Mark has syntactically separated Tyre and Sidon, and therefore called attention to the detached nature of the latter region, he very well could intend the reader to

---

<sup>141</sup> Schröter 2013, 126.

<sup>142</sup> Schröter 2013, 126 following Breytenbach 1999, 79.

<sup>143</sup> Matthew 11.21, 22, 15.21; Mark 3.8, 7.24 (though many manuscripts read just Tyre); Luke 6.17, 10.13, 14.

<sup>144</sup> See Marcus 2005, 427 where he offers New York to Washington D.C. by means of Boston and Schröter 2013, 126-128 for further discussion.

understand this part of the trip as a distinct and important piece. Jesus' travel northward before heading to the Decapolis is far from impossible or even improbable, as some have suggested.<sup>145</sup>

This demonstration that Mark may have a better command over geography than has previously been assumed should give pause to those who are quick to denounce the possibility that greater significance lies within the geographical structure of this portion of the narrative. On the most basic level, if Mark has inherited a correct historical tradition, Jesus himself created the relationship between Galilee and the foreign lands present in the Gospel. On the other hand, if redaction critics are correct that Mark is piecing together pericopae, there is no reason why the evangelist would have been restricted from constructing the narrative with a more logical geographic sequence, having Jesus travel from Tyre and Sidon, to Caesarea Philippi, to Bethsaida, to the country of the Gerasenes, and finally to the Decapolis, before returning to Galilee. For those who wish to challenge the underlying geopolitical nature of this section of the Gospel, they are left only with the possibility that Mark and the communities that read and circulated the Gospel were incompetent, which is not verifiable and relies on the premise that modern commentators must, in all instances, be better interpreters of the tradition than 1<sup>st</sup> Century CE Christians. It is more likely that Mark found significance in the admittedly complex, though not impossible, geographic structure of these chapters than that he was a poor editor. Jens Schröter takes a mediating position, stating, "Thus, the geographical specifications of the Jesus journeys in the Gospel of Mark are neither indications of the author's lack of knowledge nor can they be understood as exact journey descriptions. Instead, they summarily designate the regions in which Jesus was active outside of Galilee."<sup>146</sup>

---

<sup>145</sup> Would Marcus' example seem so ridiculous if the traveler had business in Boston before visiting family in Washington D.C.? In the same manner, Mark may see Jesus as conducting God's business in Sidon before the Feeding of the Four Thousand on the eastern side of the Sea of Galilee.

<sup>146</sup> Schröter 2013, 128.

The geopolitical sequence ends with Jesus' journey toward Jerusalem by way of the region beyond the Jordan (10.1), Jericho (10.46), and Bethany, which serves as a place of retreat throughout Chapter 11. With Jesus' journey complete, as he spent the rest of his time in Jerusalem, a broad analysis of the geographical sequence can be undertaken. Elizabeth Malbon identifies 72 actions that the evangelist ties to specific locations. These events are spread between 27 distinct locales mentioned throughout the Gospel.<sup>147</sup> A majority (41 of 72) of these events occur outside of Judea, demonstrating the evangelist's heavy focus on Jesus' activities outside the land of Judah. Further illustrating the point, of the 27 named places mentioned in the Gospel, 18 (or two-thirds) are in Galilee or foreign lands. This confirms that the Gospel is not solely concerned with the journey to Jerusalem from Galilee, as a significant amount of geographic detail is devoted to lands outside of Jerusalem.

### **From Galilee-and-Foreign-Lands to the Jewishness of Galilee**

Having established that a shift from an exclusive focus on the Galilee-to-Jerusalem paradigm to one that gives greater attention to the Galilee-and-foreign lands material is at least possible given the geographical structure in the Gospel's narrative, it remains to be seen what insights can be gained from such a shift. One important area this new focus can illuminate is the Jewish character of 1<sup>st</sup> Century CE Galilee. The previous chapter explored the reasons why some may view Galilee as Gentile, citing extra-Gospel evidence for reaching that conclusion. Additionally, scholars have pointed to passages within the Gospel of Mark that suggest the evangelist, or the audience for whom he is writing, has only a passing experience with Judaism. Mark often explains Jewish practices as if his readers may be unfamiliar with such customs, even

---

<sup>147</sup> Malbon 1986, 17-19.

inaccurately in some cases.<sup>148</sup> In Chapter Seven, for example, Jesus is confronted by the Pharisees, who observe the disciples eating with unwashed hands. The narrator interjects in v.3, “for the Pharisees and all the Jews do not eat unless they wash their hands properly, holding strongly to the tradition of the elders,” a practice that does not seem to be universal, even among observant Jews of the time.<sup>149</sup> Similar treatment is given to the Aramaic found throughout the Gospel, as Mark translates lingering Aramaic phrases from the tradition into Greek as if readers would not be able to understand them otherwise. The most famous example of this is the dying words of Jesus.<sup>150</sup> However, these factors should not be understood, as some scholars have, as relegating Judaism in the Gospel to the periphery. An analysis of how the evangelist portrays Galilee and the foreign lands in Chapters Five through Nine will demonstrate a clear dichotomy between a Jewish Galilee and the surrounding Gentile territories.

Mark’s contrast between a Jewish Galilee and the foreign lands, meant to represent Gentile nations, can be seen in the way that he incorporates specific, non-Jewish elements into their landscapes. Jesus’ journey to heal the Gerasene Demoniac, his first trip outside of Galilee, is dominated by the presence of a number of these Gentile features. The setting alone would evoke Gentile undertones for Mark’s audience, as the region east of the Sea of Galilee was predominately populated by Gentiles. Perhaps the most striking feature is that of an immense herd of pigs, which Jesus uses as vessels for the Legion of evil spirits that he exorcises from the Gerasene Demoniac. The utilization of pigs by the evangelist operates in two ways. First, the reader must recognize the land of the Gerasenes as Gentile. Jews were prohibited from eating pigs in the Torah, as YHWH declared them ritually impure;<sup>151</sup> thus, the herd’s presence in the

---

<sup>148</sup> Mark 2.19, 7.3-4, 10.2, 14.1, 14.12, 14.64, 15.42.

<sup>149</sup> Boring 2006, 199.

<sup>150</sup> See Burton 1900 for a detailed argument for the Gentile focus of the Gospel.

<sup>151</sup> Leviticus 11.7-8.

narrative only strengthens the identification of the region as inhabited by Gentiles.<sup>152</sup> Secondly, as Boring explains in his commentary, the subsequent destruction of the pigs represents, “not only the motif of tricking the demons but the victory of Israel’s God over paganism,”<sup>153</sup> a motif strengthened by Legion’s use of “the Most High God.” Marcus argues that this frequent title for Zeus was also used among Diaspora Jews in reference to YHWH, and therefore commonly employed by Gentiles to refer to the God of Israel.<sup>154</sup> Legion’s use of this designation, speaking to a Jew from Galilee, may be intended to serve as a double entendre, further evoking the contrast between Judaism and Paganism.

The pattern continues when Jesus travels to the region outside of Tyre and Sidon in Chapter Seven. Here Jesus encounters a Syrophoenician woman whom Mark identifies as Greek, that is, not Jewish.<sup>155</sup> In the following verses the two have a conversation centered on the metaphor of children eating first before dogs. Contrary to a modern characterization of dogs as “man’s best friend,” canines in the New Testament are depicted quite negatively.<sup>156</sup> Revelation portrays hostile outsiders as dogs,<sup>157</sup> and the Gospel of Matthew may associate them with pigs.<sup>158</sup> It seems to follow from New Testament texts that 1st Century CE Jews likely linked Gentiles

---

<sup>152</sup> While there may be some debate as to whether the Gerasene Demoniac is intended to be understood as Jewish or Gentile, this does not affect the region’s portrayal as Gentile, which is the main argument of this chapter. See Marcus 2005, 342-343.

<sup>153</sup> Boring 2006, 152.

<sup>154</sup> Marcus 2005, 344-345.

<sup>155</sup> Mark 7.26.

<sup>156</sup> Larry Hurtado’s October 11, 2012 blog post (<http://larryhurtado.wordpress.com/2012/10/11/dogs-doggies-and-exegesis/>) makes a strong argument based on the use of the diminutive word for “dog,” an aspect most commentators brush aside as stylistic, that Mark is not trying to portray the Gentile woman as negative. He cites evidence that shows contemporary negative portrayals of dogs use the non-diminutive form of the noun and implies that Mark’s heavily Gentile community would likely respond poorly to a pericope wherein a main character was “put into her place as a Gentile.” While I am sympathetic to Hurtado’s interpretation, whether Mark intends to represent Gentiles negatively or positively does not address the question of whether his readers would habitually associate the idea of a dog (diminutive noun or not) with Gentiles.

<sup>157</sup> See Theissen 1991, 62.

<sup>158</sup> Matthew 7.6.



with dogs, a sentiment already present in 1 Enoch.<sup>159</sup> While the passage is full of theological significance, it is also not a trivial point that the gospel writer goes out of his way to once again represent a foreign land as Gentile even if a small amount of Jews should be assumed as living there.

Gentile overtones for the remaining foreign lands of the Decapolis, Bethsaida, and Caesarea Philippi are present, though not as clearly marked. Both Caesarea Philippi and the Decapolis were heavily paganized and would have necessarily drawn such a connotation from 1<sup>st</sup> Century CE readers, unlike, for example, Syrophoenicia, which was home to small Jewish villages.<sup>160</sup> The arrival at Bethsaida is particularly interesting as Jesus commanded the disciples to travel there some time before. After the disciples depart, Jesus sees that they have made little progress and proceeds to meet them by walking on the water. The episode is yet another example of the disciples misunderstanding Jesus' nature, as they are terrified by his presence and do not understand the miracle that has taken place. After Jesus joins the disciples in the boat, they do not head to Bethsaida as originally planned, but instead they land at Gennesaret in Galilee. In the interim period between the command to go to Bethsaida in 6.45 and the actual journey there in 8.22, Jesus argues against the laws of ritual purity, which serve to separate Jews and Gentiles, travels to and heals Gentiles and exorcises demons in many of the Gentile foreign lands, and feeds a multitude in an apparently Gentile territory.<sup>161</sup> Only after this do Jesus and the disciples travel to Bethsaida where he heals a blind man. Many commentators note how this healing can be seen to mirror the extended process by which Jesus' disciples come to understand him.<sup>162</sup> However, shifting one's focus to the contrast between Galilee and foreign lands allows for

---

<sup>159</sup> Marcus 2005, 463-464; Boring 2006, 213.

<sup>160</sup> Malbon 1984, 41-42.

<sup>161</sup> Cf. Hooker 1991, 187-191.

<sup>162</sup> France 2002, 321-324; Moloney 2002, 163-164; Keenan 1995, 191-192.

additional meanings to be placed on the text,<sup>163</sup> with 6.45-8.26 being read as a unit under this geographical, and now religious, paradigm. The Feeding of the Five Thousand in 6.30-44 creates a Jewish back drop for the command to go to Bethsaida in 6.45.<sup>164</sup> Jesus' encounters with Gentiles, as detailed just prior, creates the body of the unit, with the healing of a Gentile in 8.22-26 closing the section. Therefore, the Galilee-and-foreign-lands paradigm in regard to the two-staged healing in 8.22 allows the reader to see both the two-stage journey the disciples have experienced to "see," i.e. better understand the nature of, Jesus, as well as the two-staged (Jewish to Gentile) scope of Jesus' ministry. Thus, the arrival at Bethsaida may also represent the disciples' recognition of the fact that the Gentiles are included in Jesus' salvation.<sup>165</sup>

The evangelist's depiction of foreign lands as Gentile helps create a powerful contrast for Jesus' time in Galilee. Strengthening this contrast, Mark uses the same technique discussed previously in relation to Gentile lands: associating religious symbols with geographic locations. For example, Jesus begins his ministry in Galilee by teaching in a Jewish synagogue.<sup>166</sup> Later, in Capernaum, Jesus heals a man with a withered hand *in a synagogue*.<sup>167</sup> In Chapter Six, Jesus teaches *in a synagogue* in his hometown of Nazareth. The existence of 1<sup>st</sup> Century CE synagogues in Galilee is an intensely contested issue,<sup>168</sup> as no irrefutable evidence of such structures has been found.<sup>169</sup> The matter of Mark's depiction of Galilean synagogues is not one of historicity, but one of meaning. For the present discussion, it is of no concern whether they were actually there; what matters is the implication of Mark's representation of Galilee as containing

---

<sup>163</sup> See Malbon 1986, 29.

<sup>164</sup> See Boring 2006, 179-187 for a discussion of the Jewish typology presented in this pericope.

<sup>165</sup> The scope of this chapter is primarily focused on how the Galilee-and-foreign-lands paradigm can demonstrate the Jewishness of 1<sup>st</sup> Century CE Galilee, however it likely has broader uses as well. In this instance, it may be useful for engaging the claim by those such as Robert Guelich (1989, 388) that Mark's Jesus is entirely uninterested in a "Gentile mission." See further Iverson 2007.

<sup>166</sup> Mark 1.21.

<sup>167</sup> Mark 3.1-5.

<sup>168</sup> See Meyers 1987.

<sup>169</sup> Chancey 2002, 66; see Chapter 1 fn.33

them. The early acceptance, later canonization, and use of the Gospel as a source for at least the other two Synoptics indicates that the first readers trusted the account to be valuable and adequately accurate; details in Mark's narrative must not be "historically true," but reasonably believable. As Schröter frames the debate, it is not that the "Markan narratives of scenes in synagogues are therefore 'historically trustworthy' in a naïve sense. But it shows that Mark *narrates in a historically plausible way*."<sup>170</sup> Mark's readers, and subsequently Matthew's and Luke's, found the existence of synagogues in Galilee to be "historically plausible," which strongly suggests the existence of a Jewish population in the region. The fact that Mark sets each of these teachings of Jesus in a synagogue on the Sabbath only serves to intensify their association with Judaism. Jesus' presence in a Jewish place of worship on a Jewish holy day not only illustrates his connection to the tradition, but also the region's connection to that very tradition.<sup>171</sup>

Additionally, the evangelist uses the people Jesus meets in Galilee as another means to demonstrate the region's religious population. Prior to Chapter Three, the crowd that follows Jesus consists of those who were in the synagogues when Jesus taught.<sup>172</sup> In 1.35-39, Jesus steals away to pray on his own, and when Peter finds Jesus, he tells him that "everyone is seeking you." Jesus' response is to go "throughout all Galilee, preaching in their synagogues and casting out demons." Jesus expects to find all those looking for him in the synagogues of Galilee, which must point to the Jewishness of their religious affiliation. Additionally, Jesus' encounters with Jewish authorities outside of Judea only occur in Galilee. He debates with scribes in Capernaum in 2.6 and beside the Sea of Galilee in 2.16. Not long after, Jesus is confronted by the Pharisees in 2.24 who plot to kill him in 3.6, and he is later joined by "those who had come from

---

<sup>170</sup> Schröter 2013, 121.

<sup>171</sup> The contrast is further heightened when one realizes synagogues are not once mentioned in a Gentile land.

<sup>172</sup> Mark 1.22, 27; 3.3-6.

Jerusalem” in Chapter Seven. One should not interpret the antagonistic nature in which these encounters are conducted as suggesting that the Jewish authorities are out of place in an otherwise Gentile land. On the contrary, the authorities are often placed alongside the Galilean crowd with the implication that they belong to the same religious tradition.

One final use of Jewish typology in Galilee is seen in the calling of the disciples.<sup>173</sup> In Chapter Three, Jesus and those whom he has called travel to the top of a mountain. The theological significance of mountains in Jewish Scripture is unmistakable. Before and after the building of the Tabernacle, mountains are where the patriarchs and prophets of Judaism went to be close to the God of Israel. Mark draws on this *topos* to set the calling of the disciples within a Jewish context. Jesus’ ascent onto the mountain alone demands a Mosaic connotation.<sup>174</sup> As Marcus argues,<sup>175</sup> Mark may very well be taking cues from Exodus 24.1-4, wherein Moses, after the ascent and descent of a mountain, erects 12 pillars “according to the 12 tribes of Israel.” Moreover, Biblical and contemporaneous sources such as Numbers 7 and Josephus *Ant.* 3.219-222 associate Moses with the 12 tribes. The 12 Jewish disciples, exclusively drawn from Galilee, very likely parallel the 12 tribes of Israel in the Gospel of Mark. Thus, the 12 Galileans’ ability to represent all of Israel must also be significant for understanding the population’s demography. By employing these devices in the narrative, Mark is clearly demonstrating that the Galilee he and his audience are familiar with was markedly Jewish.

Inside of the Galilee-to-Jerusalem geographic paradigm, the Jewishness of Galilee is at best barely remarkable. Shifting one’s focus to include new, Gentile lands such as those presented in Jesus’ travels throughout Chapters Five through Nine, allows the reader to

---

<sup>173</sup> See Marcus 2005, 262-263 and Malbon 1989 for an excellent discussion of the historicity of the 12 disciples.

<sup>174</sup> See Allison 1993, 174-175 for a discussion of Mark’s language being drawn from the Septuagint renderings of Moses’ journey onto the mountain to convene with God.

<sup>175</sup> Marcus 2005, 266.

appreciate the aspects of Judaism that remain in the religiously-overlooked Galilee. The evangelist's characterization of foreign lands as Gentile heightens the constructed contrast against the presence of strongly Jewish set pieces in passages about Galilee. Elizabeth Malbon sees this contrast as placing Galilee in a mediating position between the "familiar" "Jewish Homeland" and foreign lands in Mark.<sup>176</sup> While there may be some truth to her argument, especially when considering how crowds of Jews and possibly Gentiles come to encounter Jesus in Galilee and the region's geographic location as a buffer between Gentile lands and Jewish Judea,<sup>177</sup> it has the negative effect of suggesting Galilee is less Jewish than Judea.<sup>178</sup> The depiction of Galilee as Jewish discussed previously, and the fact that Mark must have Jesus leave Galilee to even encounter a Gentile, disputes such a conclusion.

This literary analysis of Mark's utilization of an appropriate geographic paradigm adds to the significant amount of evidence suggesting the population of 1<sup>st</sup> Century CE Galilee was, in fact, Jewish. Certainly, one can credit some authorial privilege in the shaping of Galilee as Jewish and foreign lands as Gentile. However, "The person of Jesus is also found here within a concrete time and a concrete space, and here too there is a reaching back to traditions and historical information in order to portray this world. Taken together these insights mean that a historical evaluation of the Gospels should start from the worlds set forth here and should analyze these with the methods of historical research and inquire into their historical plausibility."<sup>179</sup> The archaeological approach to revealing Galilee's demography is only one part of a broad range of tools available to scholars to discern the nature of Galilee's population. Here,

---

<sup>176</sup> Malbon 1986, 43.

<sup>177</sup> Malbon is implicitly arguing that those from outside the "Jewish Homeland" of Galilee and Judea mentioned in Mark 3.7 may imply the coming of Gentiles into Galilee to see Jesus. See further Iverson 2007, 10-14 interpreting Williams 1994, 11.

<sup>178</sup> While I do not think this is Malbon's intent, describing Galilee as a mediator between Gentile and Jewish lands may lead some to believe Mark's narrative suggests Galilee was populated by large amounts of Jews *and* Gentiles.

<sup>179</sup> Schröter 2013, 119.

through a careful exploration of literary techniques, it has been shown that Mark has written a narrative that has a place in a specific *historical* context, in which Galilee is presented as unambiguously Jewish.

### **CHAPTER THREE**

#### **GALILEE AND THE KINGDOM OF DAVID: AN EXAMINATION OF THE TERMS “GALILEE” AND “JUDEA” IN LUKE-ACTS**

The previous chapters have demonstrated the surge of scholarly interest in the region of Galilee as it relates to the life of Jesus. Many have approached this new focus in New Testament studies with a broad examination of issues such as economics or archaeology, yet fewer have set out to ascertain how specific authors regard Galilee distinctly from their contemporaries. Both Chapters One and Two established how such endeavors can reveal significant details relating to 1<sup>st</sup> Century CE demographics, how the Old Testament is used in the New, and even how an evangelist constructs his theology and where Jesus lies within it. Yet, the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles present a unique problem when exploring the author’s perspective on Galilee. Whereas the other evangelists are careful to strongly differentiate between their use of “Judea” and “Galilee” to represent two distinct regions, Luke seemingly disregards such a contrast in favor of a “Judea” that can mean the whole land of 1<sup>st</sup> Century CE Israel. Chapter Three examines Luke’s uses of the terms “Judea” and “Galilee” in order to establish the author’s approach to the two regions, which is an essential prerequisite for an exploration of how the regions function inside his narrative, theology, and historical methodology. After documenting and categorizing each occurrence of the terms in both the Gospel and Acts, it is demonstrated that Luke freely uses “Judea” in a broad context to mean all of Israel. This enables an exploration of his motives for doing so and what this means for his approach toward each region.

## “Galilee” in the Gospel of Luke and Acts

The term “Galilee” occurs 23 times between the Gospel of Luke and Acts of the Apostles, and its usage can be classified into three broad categories.<sup>180</sup> Luke most often employs the term in geographical contexts.<sup>181</sup> For example, Luke 17.11 states, “On the way to Jerusalem, [Jesus] was passing through the midst of Samaria and Galilee.” The importance of Luke’s focus on using Galilee to describe location should not be understated. Whether referring to cities inside of Galilee such as Nazareth or Capernaum or, more broadly, the adjacent regions of Samaria or the land of the Gerasenes, Luke demonstrates a clear understanding of 1<sup>st</sup> Century CE geography and political boundaries. In particular, he normally uses Galilee to refer to an area that is distinct from Judea. In fact, of all 23 occurrences of “Galilee” throughout Luke-Acts, only two could be said to be geographically ambiguous.<sup>182</sup> Both Luke 23.5 and Acts 10.37 make broad geographical references to Jesus’ ministry:

Table 3.1: Comparison of Luke 23.5 and Acts 10.37

<u>Luke 23.5</u>	<u>Acts 10.37</u>
But they were urgent, saying, He stirs up the people, teaching throughout all Judea, from Galilee even to this place. <sup>183</sup>	You yourselves know what happened throughout all Judea, beginning from Galilee after the baptism that John proclaimed.

In each passage, Galilee could be read as a part of “all Judea.” While one must be cautious not to make strict delineations,<sup>184</sup> “Judea” traditionally refers to the land south of Samaria that the Kingdom of Judah occupied before its destruction in 587 BCE. By the time of Jesus’ life, Rome had incorporated the region with Samaria and Idumea into a province they designated *Iudaea*, a

<sup>180</sup> See Appendix I: Table A.1; “Galilee” in this chapter can refer to any of the following constructions: Γαλιλαία, Γαλιλαίαν, Γαλιλαίας, Γαλιλαῖοι, Γαλιλαῖός, Γαλιλαίους, or Γαλιλαίων.

<sup>181</sup> Luke 1.26, 2.4, 2.39, 3.1, 4.31, 8.26, 17.11, 24.6; Acts 13.31.

<sup>182</sup> See Appendix I: Table A.2.

<sup>183</sup> Both the translation and format of any verse appearing in parallel throughout this chapter (as Luke 23.5 and Acts 10.37 do here) originate from the 6<sup>th</sup> ed. of Kurt Aland’s Greek-English Synopsis of the Four Gospels 1983.

<sup>184</sup> See Geiger 2002.



Latin derivative of Judah. Galilee, on the other hand, was the region north of Samaria. Control of the region shifted throughout the centuries, at times belonging to Hasmoneans, Herodians, and Romans.<sup>185</sup> As addressed below, after further discussion of Luke's use of the term "Galilee," it becomes apparent that because the passage's foremost geographical concern is "all Judea," the ambiguity lies in how Luke uses that term rather than "Galilee."

"Galilee" also serves as a way of identifying characters throughout the narratives.<sup>186</sup> After Gethsemane, when denying any association with the now-arrested Jesus, Peter is identified as a Galilean by a member of the crowd (Mk 14.70 || Mt 25.73).<sup>187</sup> Similarly, in Acts 2.5-7, Jews who come from "every nation under heaven," are amazed when they can understand Galileans in their native languages. In each of these instances, the identifications primarily serve a narrative purpose.<sup>188</sup> Peter's Galilean descent is only important insofar as it betrays his true relation to Jesus. Likewise, the identification of the disciples as Galileans in Acts 2.7 is not intended to ascribe supernatural capabilities to those from the region, but rather demonstrates the power the Holy Spirit has to spread the Gospel.

The most obscure occurrences of "Galilee" come in the excessively debated "central section," or "travel narrative," in 9.51-19.28.<sup>189</sup> Situated in a section of the travel narrative wherein Jesus chastises those gathered around him for refusing to see the signs of the present, Luke uses an otherwise unattested story of Pilate murdering Galileans as they worshiped.<sup>190</sup> The relevance of "Galilee" in this story is initially unclear.<sup>191</sup> While scholars have suggested a number of possible sources for this pericope, including incidents in Josephus' *Jewish Wars* and

---

<sup>185</sup> See Chapter 1.

<sup>186</sup> See Appendix I: Table A.1; Luke 3.1, 5.17, 22.59, 23.6, 23.49, 23.55; Acts 1.11, 2.7, 5.37, 9.31.

<sup>187</sup> Luke 22.59.

<sup>188</sup> See Freyne 2000, 28.

<sup>189</sup> Cf. Bacon 1918; Franklin 2010; Gill 1970; Shirock 1993.

<sup>190</sup> Luke 13.1-2.

<sup>191</sup> However the reference to sacrifices and comparison with those gathered around Jesus is yet another attestation of the Jewish nature of Galilean demographics in the 1<sup>st</sup> Century CE.

*Antiquities of the Jews*,<sup>192</sup> it is not necessary to determine the exact historical roots of the episode to analyze the use of “Galilee” in this narrative. Robert Shirock makes a compelling argument that 13.1-9, where the references to Galileans are found, is the first part of a chiasmic structure with the concluding counterpart in 13.31-35, both of which are unique to Luke’s Gospel.<sup>193</sup> Shirock suggests 13.1-9 poses the question, “Will Israel repent and retain her place?” with 13.10-30 elaborating on the problems that arise when trying to answer that question positively; namely, Israel’s leaders are hypocrites. In this model, 13.31-35 answers the question with, “Israel will be judged by God regardless of whether or not hypocrites reside within it.”<sup>194</sup> Assuming Shirock is correct, Luke either extracted the account of Pilate’s murders from a non-extant source or, more likely, created it in order to pair it with 13.31-35 and thus complete the chiasmus.<sup>195</sup> Therefore, the occurrences of “Galilee” at the beginning of Chapter 13 fit within the previously discussed paradigm of furthering the narrative, though admittedly here with a strong theological undercurrent. While this leaves all 23 appearances of “Galilee” throughout Luke and Acts categorized, simply analyzing how Luke uses the term cannot provide a full understanding of its significance for the evangelist.

Beyond how “Galilee” occurs in the narrative is the question of why Luke chose to include references to the region in the first place. Undoubtedly, on the most basic level, the tradition demanded it. Jesus and his disciples were itinerant preachers from Galilee, and while the narrative was shaped to accentuate distinct and important convictions of the evangelists’ communities, disregarding the formative stage of Jesus’ ministry in the region would likely have been detrimental to the acceptance and future canonization of any of the Gospels.

---

<sup>192</sup> See Bock 1994, 238.

<sup>193</sup> Shirock 1993, 17-21.

<sup>194</sup> Shirock 1993, 25.

<sup>195</sup> Certainly Luke does not have to fabricate or significantly distort history for his readers to find this plausible, as Josephus’ and Philo’s portrayals of Pilate in *Jewish War/Antiquities* and *On the Embassy of Gaius* demonstrate.

The instances of “Galilee” in the Gospel of Luke can be examined with this basic level in mind precisely because it exists in some sort of relationship with the other Synoptics, Mark and Matthew. The Synoptic Problem, namely the study of the similarities and differences between the Synoptic Gospels in an attempt to explain their literary relationship (or as Mark Goodacre renders it, who has been copying from whom<sup>196</sup>), is important for interpreting which occurrences of “Galilee” in Luke are tradition-dependent and which are the evangelist’s additions. The two most prominent solutions to the Synoptic Problem, namely the Two-Source Hypothesis and the Farrer-Goulder-Goodacre Hypothesis, argue for Marcan priority, or that Mark was the first canonical Gospel written. Subsequently, Matthew and Luke used Mark as a source when writing their Gospels. Therefore, because Luke has access to at least Mark, any time Luke preserves a reference to Galilee that Mark first included in his Gospel, it is a reasonable assumption that Luke does so because he desired to retain an emphasis on Galilee, because he viewed it as mandated by the tradition, or simply because the narrative depended on the detail for clarity. In any case, a “Galilee” that is first in the Gospel of Mark cannot play a central role in determining Luke’s particular priorities, agendas, or methodologies because it did not originate with him.

Surprisingly, only two of 17 occurrences of “Galilee” in Luke are explicitly present first in Mark.<sup>197</sup> After John the Baptist is arrested, all four Gospels have Jesus return from temptation in the wilderness to Galilee. Similarly, Peter’s denial of Jesus in Luke 22.59, discussed previously, is also a piece of tradition that appears in all four Gospels, though only Mark and Luke share the explicit reference to Galilee.<sup>198</sup> However, by slightly relaxing the criteria for which occurrences of “Galilee” can be considered influenced by the tradition, four more verses

---

<sup>196</sup> Goodacre 2001, 16.

<sup>197</sup> Luke 4.14, 22.59.

<sup>198</sup> Matthew forgoes calling Peter a Galilean in favor of unpacking Mark’s meaning by having Peter’s accuser draw attention to his accent, thus identifying where he is from. On the other hand, John simplifies the pericope and reduces the tradition to the bare essentials, leaving out “Galilee” altogether.

can be added to this subset. First, Luke 24.1-9 is a section of Triple Tradition material that is present in each of the Synoptics. In the Marcan and Matthean parallels, the angel (or young man) at Jesus' tomb tells the women that Jesus has gone ahead of them to Galilee.<sup>199</sup> In contrast, Luke does not have the resurrected Jesus appear in Galilee, but rather in Jerusalem. Possessing at the minimum a copy of Mark, Luke likely felt some tension in his narrative due to this substantial change in location. Interestingly, the Gospel of Luke alone has an additional sentence inside of this pericope: "Remember how he told you, while he was still in *Galilee* that, 'the Son of man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and on the third day rise.'"<sup>200</sup> The evangelist may have been pressured by the other narrative(s) to at least mention Galilee, and thus, perhaps, slightly reduce the tension for those readers who were familiar with either Mark, Matthew, or a broader tradition of Jesus appearing in Galilee after his resurrection.

The second and third possible additions to those occurrences of "Galilee" obtained from the tradition interact with the Synoptic Problem. Of the two solutions that hold Marcan priority, the Two-Source Hypothesis argues that Luke and Matthew independently drew from a now non-extant source, Q. In contrast to this view, the Farrer-Goulder-Goodacre Hypothesis posits that Luke also had access to Matthew as a source for his Gospel. While the scope of this chapter does not allow for an extensive analysis of the implications these two examples suggest in regard to the Synoptic Problem, the existence of the Farrer-Goulder-Goodacre Hypothesis and the designation of the third example as a so-called "minor agreement" make it necessary to count the following two occurrences of "Galilee" among uses that may be tradition-dependent. The first of these two additions, Luke 2.39 || Matthew 2.22, occurs in the infancy narrative. Both Luke and Matthew must have Jesus and his family return to Galilee after their stay in Jerusalem and Egypt,

---

<sup>199</sup> Mk 16.1-8 || Mt 28.1-8.

<sup>200</sup> Luke 24.6-7.

respectively. Whether adopted from Matthew, or perhaps more likely required by tradition, this instance of “Galilee” cannot be considered independent as the historical Jesus came from a Galilean city. Luke 23.49, the third addition, follows a similar pattern when identifying the women at the tomb as Galileans. In this case, the verse paralleled with Matthew 27.55 creates the most minor of agreements by shifting the placement of “Galilee” in the pericope.

Table 3.2: Comparison of Matthew 27.55-56, Mark 15.40, and Luke 23.49

<u>Matthew 27.55-56</u>	<u>Mark 15.40</u>	<u>Luke 23.49</u>
There were also many women there, looking on from afar, <i>who had followed Jesus from Galilee</i> , ministering to him; among whom were Mary Magdalene...	There were also many women there, looking on from afar, among whom were Mary Magdalene...	And all his acquaintances and the women <i>who had followed him from Galilee</i> stood at a distance and saw these things

Mark in fact has “Galilee” in 15.41 identifying the women as ones who had followed him “when he was in Galilee.” The other two evangelists have moved this detail forward, slightly reworking the language.

The fourth and final addition follows the pattern of fronting Galilee in the narrative. In the story of Jesus healing a demoniac in the synagogue early in his ministry, Mark begins by setting the healing in Capernaum and later having the news of Jesus’ deeds spread throughout Galilee. Luke has chosen to move the “Galilee” from the end of the pericope using it to better identify Capernaum.

Table 3.3: Comparison of Mark 1.21-28 and Luke 4.31-37

<u>Mark 1.21-28</u>	<u>Luke 4.31-37</u>
They went to Capernaum; and when the Sabbath came, he entered the synagogue and taught... At once his fame began to spread throughout the surrounding region of Galilee.	He went down to Capernaum, a city in Galilee, and was teaching them on the Sabbath... And reports of him went out into every place in the surrounding region.

Ultimately, Luke has adopted less than half of Mark's references to Galilee, leaving all remaining Lucan references to the region in the Gospel unique to Luke.<sup>201</sup>

Having examined the instances of "Galilee" Luke retained from Mark and the broader tradition, as is the case with the infancy narrative, one might expect that the 11 additional appearances of "Galilee" that occur exclusively in the Gospel of Luke would be found in material unique to the Gospel, often called "Special Luke." This assumption is bolstered when one considers that Luke only incorporates five of 13 Marcan "Galilee"s, i.e. if Luke chose to exclude eight references to the region from his source material, the remaining Lucan instances could be expected in material he added to the tradition. Yet only two of these occurrences fit the presumed pattern. The first, Luke 1.26, is situated in the Lucan birth narrative, and the second occurs in the Cleansing of the Ten Lepers pericope.<sup>202</sup> The remaining nine unique-to-Luke references are found in a combination of Double Tradition,<sup>203</sup> Triple Tradition,<sup>204</sup> and material all four Gospels share.<sup>205</sup> While the "Galilee"s found in Special Luke could be explained either as the author's own creations or as originating in now non-extant sources that Luke possessed, these remaining nine are of exceeding consequence since they clearly demonstrate that Luke adds "Galilee" into his narrative in certain places where the other evangelists do not.

<sup>201</sup> See Appendix I: Tables A.3, A.4.

<sup>202</sup> Luke 17.11-19.

<sup>203</sup> Luke 2.4.

<sup>204</sup> Luke 5.17, 8.26, 13.1-2, 23.6.

<sup>205</sup> Luke 3.1, 23.5.

## **“Judea” in the Gospel of Luke and Acts**

The fact that Luke sometimes adds “Galilee” into his narrative is particularly significant when discussing the occurrences of the term “Judea” in the Gospel and Acts. Similar to Luke’s uses of “Galilee” throughout Luke-Acts, “Judea” can also be classified into comparable categories.<sup>206</sup> Again, Luke primarily employs the term in the context of defining geography, once more showing his command of the region’s political and geographical landscape.<sup>207</sup> For example, Acts 12.19 states, “And after Herod searched for [Peter] and did not find him, he questioned the guards and commanded that they should be put to death. And he went down from Judea to Caesarea and remained there.” Additionally, “Judea” can be used as a form of identification, as in Luke 3.1, “In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea...” A number of these occurrences of “Judea” are clearly geographically exact, that is, they only refer to what is traditionally thought of as the land of Judea as described previously.<sup>208</sup> Luke 3.1, mentioned above, is presumably an example of this, as Pilate’s jurisdiction did not stretch beyond this region. Luke commonly uses ἀπό plus “Judea” when he intends a narrowly defined location, as in Acts 12.19, 15.1, and 21.10. However, where only two instances of the term “Galilee” could be interpreted as equivocal (and in each case, I argued that the vagueness derived not from “Galilee” but from the term “Judea”), at least half of the 22 occurrences of “Judea” can be understood as referring to the ancestral Kingdom of Judah *and* lands beyond it.<sup>209</sup>

These geographically ambiguous occurrences of “Judea” can be further classified by how likely it is that they refer to more than Judea itself. Acts 11.29 is the most ambiguous of the 11 in

---

<sup>206</sup> See Appendix I: Table A.5.

<sup>207</sup> Luke 1.65, 2.4, 4.44, 7.17, 21.21, 23.5; Acts 1.18, 8.1, 9.31, 10.37, 11.1, 11.29, 12.19, 15.1, 21.10, 28.21.

<sup>208</sup> See Appendix I: Table A.6; Luke 2.4, 3.1, 5.17; Acts 12.19, 15.1, 21.10.

<sup>209</sup> Luke 1.5, 6.17, 7.17, 23.5; Acts 1.18, 2.9, 8.1, 10.37, 11.1, 11.29, 26.20.

Conzelmann sees this as irrefutable evidence that the author of Luke was unfamiliar with and uncaring of the geopolitical boundaries of Israel (Conzelmann 1961, 69). He goes on to explain that any correct representation of geography in the Gospel must be inherited by the evangelist (Conzelmann 1961, 94).

question. In the surrounding verses, the Church of Antioch, in modern day Syria, is made aware of an impending worldwide famine by a Jerusalemite prophet named Agabus.<sup>210</sup> Acts 11.29-30 reveals the Antiochian Church's intention to supply relief to those in "Judea" by sending supplies with Paul and Barnabas. While it is possible to interpret this passage as the church being solely interested in helping those brothers and sisters in ancestral Judea, a perhaps more likely explanation is that they wanted their aid distributed to as wide of a region as possible. The latter of these interpretations is arguably supported by both Luke's terminology for the collection and the contents of the proceeding chapter. Paul describes a collection for the poor of Jerusalem in Romans 15.25-26 and 1 Corinthians 16.1-3,<sup>211</sup> yet Luke never explicitly details a "Jerusalem" collection in Acts. On the contrary, here Luke describes a broader place of reception for charitable gifts. It is at least possible that Luke, being familiar with the collection Paul relates in his letters, chose to broaden the scope by changing "Jerusalem" to "Judea." This change would have a stronger impact if Luke intends the reader to interpret "Judea" as "Judea, Samaria, and Galilee." It may then be significant that just after reporting the collection in Acts 11, Acts 12 is concerned with Herod Agrippa, who at least briefly ruled over a combined Judea, Samaria, and Galilee in 41-44 CE.<sup>212</sup> Luke's terminology and subsequent reference to a ruler who reigned over the "restored" Judea opens the possibility of Luke intending the "Judea" in 11.29 to mean a land beyond the traditional political boundaries of the region.

There are, however, clear instances in which the evangelist uses "Judea" to mean all of Israel. For example, Luke 1.5 states, "In the days of Herod, king of Judea, there was a certain priest..." While there is clearly debate about Luke's historical accuracy as it pertains to the rulers

---

<sup>210</sup> Acts 11.28.

<sup>211</sup> 2 Corinthians 8-9 is likely describing the same collection, though "Jerusalem" is never mentioned explicitly.

<sup>212</sup> Chancey 2005, 46-47.



of Israel around the birth of Jesus,<sup>213</sup> his use of “king/βασιλεύς” instead of “tetrarch/τετρααρχοῦντος” here (in contrast to 14.1) safely identifies the Herod of 1.5 as Herod the Great. This Herod’s kingdom stretched from Idumea in the south to even farther north than Galilee. Therefore, Luke’s use of “Judea” in 1.5 is meant to include Judea, Samaria, and Galilee, among other regions. Similarly, Acts 2.9-10 paints a broad geographic picture as Luke lists vast regions from which the people who hear the disciples had come to Jerusalem.<sup>214</sup> Luke’s concept of “Judea” in these verses almost certainly includes Galilee and the surrounding lands, as otherwise the Holy Spirit would have had no effect on those present from that region or Samaria.

Strengthening the argument that “Judea” can refer to both the land of Judea and Galilee, the majority of the ambiguous occurrences use a form of κατά, ὅλος, or πᾶς modifying “Judea.”<sup>215</sup> These preceding modifiers seem to broaden the scope of what would traditionally be called “Judea.” Rather than simple “Judea,” they appear to turn the term into “all of” or “the whole of” Judea. The two geographically ambiguous verses that include Galilee (mentioned above) fall into this category. Luke 23.5 reads, “But they were urgent, saying, he stirs up the people, teaching throughout *all* Judea, beginning from Galilee even to this place.” As previously argued, “from Galilee even to this place,” contextualizes what “*all* Judea” refers to. In the same way that Luke used ἀπό with “Judea” to mean solely Judea, he appears to use these three markers to designate the times that he intends Judea to mean all of Israel.

---

<sup>213</sup> Cf. Franklin 2010, 928-929.

<sup>214</sup> “Parthians and Medes and Elamites and residents of Mesopotamia, Judea, and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, Egypt and the parts of Libya belonging to Cyrene, and visitors from Rome...”

<sup>215</sup>

κατά:	Acts 11.1 & 8.1
ὅλος:	Luke 7.17 & 23.5
πᾶς:	Luke 6.17, Acts 1.8, 10.37, & 26.20

As with “Galilee,” comparing the occurrences of “Judea” in Luke with their Synoptic parallels can reveal important information.<sup>216</sup> This exercise with “Galilee” demonstrated that Luke sometimes intentionally added the term to his narrative, as the majority of unique instances were found inside of tradition material that he shared with the other evangelists. Yet, the same exercise with “Judea” produces very different results. There are only 10 occurrences of “Judea” in the Gospel; however, two of these, Luke 4.44 and 6.17, are a special case that must be dealt with in detail separately. Applying the same criteria as before with “Galilee,” namely that if the term appears in either Matthew or Mark, then Luke likely used it because he was in some way constrained by the tradition, three of the remaining nine “Judea”s can be called tradition-dependent.<sup>217</sup> Additionally, just as before, if we leave the Special Luke “Judea” references out of consideration, with the rationale that some or all of them might be due to non-extant sources that Luke possessed, this leaves only two of the nine unique occurrences in material shared by the other evangelists.<sup>218</sup> Whereas 80% of the unique “Galilee”s were intentionally inserted into the narrative, a mere 20% of the unique “Judea”s follow that pattern.<sup>219</sup> While at first 20% may seem significant, it should be kept in mind that this only represents two instances of “Judea” unique to Luke’s Gospel. Furthermore, the evangelist has already shown a willingness to alter these two particular pieces of Triple Tradition, as they are also examples of verses where he has added “Galilee” when the Synoptic parallels lacked it, as discussed above.

---

<sup>216</sup> See Appendix I: Tables A.7, A.8.

<sup>217</sup> Luke 2.4, 3.1, 21.21.

<sup>218</sup> It should be noted that there could be a number of reasons why “Judea” or “Galilee” would occur in Special Luke material, and that simply saying they came from now non-extant sources may be simplifying the issue too drastically. Yet, however Luke produced this material, whether influenced or not, the main point to understand is that because we cannot compare it to the other Gospels, these occurrences can offer little understanding to the present exercise.

<sup>219</sup> Luke 5.17, 23.5.

Luke 4.44 is a complication of this pattern. The verse fits with Luke 5.17 and 23.5 as examples where the author has added “Judea” to Triple Tradition material. However, in this case, Luke has changed Mark’s and Matthew’s “Galilee” to “Judea.”

Table 3.4: Comparison of Matthew 4.23, Mark 1.39, and Luke 4.44

<u>Matthew 4.23</u>	<u>Mark 1.39</u>	<u>Luke 4.44</u>
And he went about all <i>Galilee</i> teaching in their synagogues	And he went throughout all <i>Galilee</i> preaching in their synagogues	And he was preaching in the synagogues of <i>Judea</i>
and preaching the gospel of the kingdom and healing every disease and every infirmity among the people	and casting out demons	

Some scholars write this change off, only noting that it fits a broader framework of Luke using “Judea” to mean all of Israel.<sup>220</sup> While these scholars are correct, they sometimes fail to identify the passage as the best evidence for Luke’s comprehensive Judea paradigm. At the very least, Luke had access to Mark, and it can be argued that he possessed Matthew as well.<sup>221</sup> Therefore, he appears to have actively altered their “Galilee” to “Judea.” Furthermore, interpreting this passage to mean the province of Judea creates narrative problems at best. Just prior to 4.44, Jesus was preaching in the *Galilean* city of Capernaum, and immediately after 4.44, calls the first of the *Galilean* disciples. Luke 6.17 follows the same pattern when compared to its parallel, Mark 3.7. In both cases, a “great multitude” follows Jesus to the Sea of Galilee. Luke segregates the crowd into two distinct groups, those from “all Judea and Jerusalem” and those from “the seacoast of Tyre and Sidon.” Conversely, Mark further partitions the group by mentioning

---

<sup>220</sup> Franklin 2010, 933.

<sup>221</sup> See Goodacre 2002.

Galilee, Judea, Jerusalem, and Idumea, along with Tyre and Sidon. Consequently, these two examples clearly demonstrate that Luke is using “Judea” to mean something much more than solely the region south of Samaria. Yet simply demonstrating that Luke is making such a change in terminology does not explain why he is doing so.

### **Conclusions**

With a superficial reading, it may be tempting to think Luke is aiming to deemphasize Galilee in favor of Judea. In fact, Luke lacks seven of 13 occurrences of “Galilee” in the Gospel of Mark; however, only two of the six can be called outright removals.<sup>222</sup> In Mark 1.16, Jesus calls Simon and Andrew at “the Sea of Galilee.” Luke has altered this pericope in 5.1-11 while retaining the substance of the Marcan version. In doing so, Luke changes Mark’s “Sea of Galilee” to “Lake of Gennesaret.” Yet, this is not a diminishing of Galilee, as the body of water was traditionally referred to as the “Lake of Gennesaret,” “Lake of Gennesar,” or even the “Lake of Tiberias,” as in John 6.1. Mark is the first to call the lake “Sea of Galilee,” and Luke is likely simply referring to it with a more widely accepted and understood title.<sup>223</sup> The second occurrence of Luke excising Galilee from a Marcan passage<sup>224</sup> occurs in a text that he heavily altered in structure and sequence.<sup>225</sup> Luke leaves out a geographical reference to Galilee at the beginning of Jesus foretelling his Passion for a second time in 9.43-45. However, Luke’s last geographical identification is one he adds to Triple Tradition in 9.10: Bethsaida, a Galilean city. Therefore, he may not have felt it necessary to repeat the location as a part of his stylistic reworking of Mark. The remaining four instances of “Galilee” found in Mark but not Luke occur in pericopae that

---

<sup>222</sup> Mark 1.16, 9.30.

<sup>223</sup> Malbon 1984, 364.

<sup>224</sup> Mark 9.30.

<sup>225</sup> See Freyne 1988, 92-93.

Luke lacks altogether.<sup>226</sup> Luke's removal of a pericope that includes Galilee is unable to add to this discussion, as any number of factors could have influenced him to abandon the story entirely.

An additional reason for assuming Luke favors Judea over Galilee could be supposed since Luke has repeatedly had "Judea" stand in place of "Judea, Samaria, and Galilee." Readers of the Gospel could begin to associate Jesus more strongly with southern Judea rather than northern Galilee. Superficially, this theory has support from within the Gospel. For example, Luke is the second of the two canonical Gospels that have Jesus born in a *Judean* city: Bethlehem. Moreover, whereas Mark and Matthew have the resurrected Christ appear in Galilee, Luke has him appear in another *Judean* city: Jerusalem. However, the study of Synoptic parallels above provides strong evidence against this theory. If Luke intended to diminish the importance of Galilee in favor of highlighting Judea, he would presumably not have added inside of shared material an abundant amount of tradition-dependent references to Galilee in his narrative.

At least to some extent, Luke may be drawing from the most recent Jewish Kingdom's boundaries. The Hasmoneans ruled an area that included Judea, Samaria, and Galilee from 140 BCE to 37 BCE. First Maccabees 10.38 states, "And three cities are added to Judea, out of the country of Samaria, let them be accounted with Judea: that they may be under one, and obey no other authority but that of the high priest," while 11.34 has three more cities brought under the dominion (and name) of Judea. These verses show a precedent for how Luke uses "Judea," and here too there are seemingly good reasons that could suggest that this historical approach is what the author has in mind. For example, Luke's prologue and subsequent handling of the narrative have led many scholars to emphasize his role as a historian, sometimes over and against his role

---

<sup>226</sup> Mark 1.9, 6.21, 7.31, 14.28.

as an evangelist.<sup>227</sup> However, all other contemporaneous sources, whether intracanonical, such as the other Gospels, or extracanonical, as with the works of Josephus, are exceedingly careful to draw clear geographical distinctions between Judea and Galilee.<sup>228</sup> This suggests, at least when concerning those outside of the Luke-Acts community, a purely historical motivation would not have significantly registered with those reading the evangelist's work.

Yet a mediating standpoint, considering the theologically-charged and historically-concerned positions discussed above, can provide the inspiration for Luke using Judea to mean Judea, Galilee, and Samaria. Mark Strauss convincingly argues in *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts* that the evangelist is keeping alive the hope for a Jewish messiah from the house of David and that this messiah will be the source of a gospel that “went forth from a restored Israel.”<sup>229</sup> “Israel” would have been problematic in Luke's time, as the Gospels' (including his own) usage of the term suggests that by the 1<sup>st</sup> Century CE, “Israel” often referred to a group of people rather than the land between Judea's southern and Galilee's northern borders.<sup>230</sup> “Judea”, on the other hand, does have a geographical referent (rather than an ethnic one). Additionally, David is from Judah and his descendants ruled over the region until the time of the Diaspora. David Ravens, in his work: *Luke and the Restoration of Israel*, comes to the same conclusion by devoting special attention to both the Lucan infancy narrative and Luke's interest in Samaritans.<sup>231</sup> If Luke

---

<sup>227</sup> See Rothschild 2004 (particularly Ch. 8 where she pushes back against such claims while still keeping Luke's historiography in perspective).

<sup>228</sup> Josephus' use of Judea is consistent with the Roman province's boundaries. See specifically *War* 3.3.4-5 for a description of Judea's boundaries. Additionally, Josephus often brings together references to the temple and/or Jerusalem with Judea as in *Ant.* 14.7.1, 14.7.2, 14.11.7. When Josephus narrates Gabinius' campaign in Judea, Josephus notes that he traveled throughout “other parts of Judea” rebuilding cities (*Ant.* 14.5.3), and no city mentioned lies within Galilean borders. In *Ant.* 12.8.2, Josephus tells the reader that “Joseph, the son of Zacharias, and Azarias, to be set over the rest of the forces; and charged them to keep Judea very carefully, and to fight no battles with any persons whomsoever until his return. Accordingly, Simon went into Galilee, and fought the enemy, and put them to flight, and pursued them to the very gates of Ptolemais,” clearly indicating a distinction between the regions. Thus, Luke's use of “Judea” to mean all of Israel is not seen in his contemporary.

<sup>229</sup> Strauss 1995, 346.

<sup>230</sup> See Luke 1.16, 1.68, 1.80, 2.32, 22.30, etc.

<sup>231</sup> Ravens 1995, particularly 11-106. See also Freyne 1988, 93.

wished to highlight Jesus' role as a Davidic messiah while also emphasizing a restored kingdom, referring to the land of Israel as Judea fits perfectly.<sup>232</sup> This restored kingdom includes Galilee, and Luke regularly adds references to the region to highlight this point lest any reader write the region off as unimportant or unconnected.

This exploration of Luke's uses of "Judea" and "Galilee" began by noting the evangelist's complex and sometimes puzzling conflation of "Judea" with what many would call "the land of Israel." An analysis of the occurrences of "Galilee" was necessary to understand first, if Luke grasped a firm knowledge of the geography of the whole region, and second, how he regarded the land from which Jesus came. Here it was discovered that "Galilee," just like "Judea," is used to identify people and speak about locations. Yet the analysis of the Synoptic parallels proved enlightening, as they inarguably show that Luke added references to Galilee where the tradition did not require them.<sup>233</sup> This is particularly important when it is made clear that "Judea" could refer to more than just the Roman province of the time, as one could have otherwise interpreted Luke's utilization of the term as an attempt to diminish the significance of Galilee. In the end, only by incorporating aspects of both historical and theological rationalizations of Luke's intent can one fully understand why the evangelist chose "Judea" to speak about a restored Israel.

---

<sup>232</sup> Luke's unique lack of Jesus' journeys to foreign lands, such as those discussed in Chapter 2, may also support the argument that he is emphasizing a Davidic messiah over a restored Israel. This is especially true when considering that Luke is also uniquely emphasizing Samaritans in his Gospel, perhaps suggesting he has substituted references to Gentile populations in favor of those who would be inside of this restored kingdom. Such a practice could be seen as complimentary to the often-accepted idea that Luke is saving much of the Gentile-related concepts until Acts.

<sup>233</sup> This is perhaps the most damning evidence against Conzelmann's claim that "Galilee" has no fundamental significance for Luke as a region" (1961, 69). Instead, it is the Galileans as witnesses that Conzelmann argues the author is interested in (1961, 38). However, the evidence does not support this. Of the nine unique-to-Luke instances of Galilee that he has inserted into tradition, only three are "Galilean/s" in contrast to the six "Galilee"s. Cf. Davies 1974, 244-252 for a valuable argument against the many other issues with Conzelmann's understanding of geography in the Gospel of Luke.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **GALILEE AND THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD: AN ANALYSIS OF THE ROLE OF GALILEE IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN**

Scholarship on the Gospel of John is undeniably extensive, covering topics from Christology to 1<sup>st</sup> Century CE Judaism and early church polemics; yet, the issue of location, specifically Galilee, has held little interest for many scholars. Even the recent surge in Galilee research over the last half-century has had relatively little to say about what role Galilee plays in the Fourth Gospel. The Second Chapter of this thesis engaged with the prevailing Galilee-to-Jerusalem geographic paradigm found in the Synoptics, and under that archetype the significance of Galilee has been readily explored. However, the Gospel of John takes a geographically different approach, wherein Jesus travels between Jerusalem and Galilee throughout the narrative. The lack of emphasis placed on the contrast presented in the Synoptics has led to a dearth of scholarship in regard to a literary search for region's importance. This chapter attempts to address such a deficiency by demonstrating that Galilee has a far more important role in John than expected given the amount of space the evangelist devotes to it. While Galilee and its function are not the primary concerns of the Gospel of John, they are still important for understanding the evangelist's interpretation of who Jesus was and how early followers understood the region in the context of his mission. Key passages featuring Galilee will be examined in order to highlight the region's prominent significance.



## Galilee as a Safe Haven

Unmistakably, the Gospel of John aims to portray Galilee as a safe environment for Jesus and his followers. The evangelist introduces this concept at the beginning of the Samaritan woman pericope. Jesus travels to Galilee by way of Samaria specifically because he knows the Pharisees have learned of his growing popularity, suggesting that Galilee was a safe-haven from them.<sup>234</sup> Many scholars choose to focus on the proceeding verse, “And [Jesus] had to pass through Samaria,”<sup>235</sup> noting that the geography of Israel in no way necessitates such a route.<sup>236</sup> Therefore, the use of δεῖ indicates that the purpose of the following episode is somehow integral to Jesus’ divine mission on Earth.<sup>237</sup> While this reading is correct, focusing on this point can diminish the role of Galilee with the result that the catalyst for the initial journey is ignored. The Pharisees have only been portrayed as inquisitive by this point in the narrative,<sup>238</sup> which may lead some to believe the move to Galilee is purely incidental; however, at best this interpretation would only occur to first-time Gospel readers who would be unfamiliar with traditions such as those found in the Synoptics. More likely, such readers would understand the implicit causal connection between the Pharisees’ knowledge and Jesus’ movements, which is most easily read as threatening intent. Such an issue of interpretation would not have presented itself to the community hearing or reading the Gospel again as, even without the kinds of traditions that lie behind the Synoptics, they have clear foreknowledge of how the Pharisees will seek to kill Jesus in the coming narrative.

---

<sup>234</sup> John 4.1-3; see also Matthew 2.22, 4.12.

<sup>235</sup> John 4.4: ἔδει δὲ αὐτὸν διέρχεσθαι διὰ τῆς Σαμαρείας.

<sup>236</sup> See Barrett 1978, 230; Bultmann 1971, 176; Lincoln 2005, 171.

<sup>237</sup> Some scholars such as Barrett and Bultmann, citing Josephus *Vita* 269, suggest “ἔδει” can be used secularly to indicate that a route through Samaria was simply the shortest. As with many topics in the Gospel of John, there is no reason why this detail cannot function on two levels: Jesus takes the shortest route to Galilee and that journey is ordained by God. See Lincoln 2005, 171 and Keener 2003, 589-590 for strong arguments for taking the “ἔδει” as divine will.

<sup>238</sup> John 1.19-27; 3.1-21.

The same motif of safety is subtly present in Chapters Five and Six. Chapter Five opens with the healing of a blind man on the Sabbath. After the man is healed, the Jewish authorities learn of the sign through him and seek to persecute and kill Jesus for healing on the Sabbath and for perceived blasphemy against God.<sup>239</sup> The remainder of Chapter Five details Jesus' response to the authorities, wherein "the point of view of this Gospel's narrative emerges through the device of a defense speech in which the defendant is shown to be the judge who at the same time calls for a re-evaluation of the traditional criteria for judgment."<sup>240</sup> The trial motif used by the evangelist introduces tension into the narrative. This tension, combined with the move to Galilee in 6.1, should resonate with the opening of Chapter Four discussed previously. It is no coincidence that the second time the Pharisees are presented as hostile, this time explicitly, Jesus again travels to Galilee in search of safety, an association that will be strengthened in the coming narrative when the location of Judea is brought up again in Chapter Seven.

Some scholars have argued that Chapter Six originally came before Chapter Five, on the basis that the narrative would flow more logically should these two chapters be reversed.<sup>241</sup> Throughout Chapters Four and Seven, Jesus travels between Galilee and Jerusalem multiple times. The geographical movement has Jesus begin in Galilee,<sup>242</sup> journey to Jerusalem for an unnamed festival,<sup>243</sup> appear in Galilee without a discussion of how he traveled there,<sup>244</sup> and finally, return to Jerusalem for Sukkot.<sup>245</sup> Those scholars that dispute the received order of Chapters Five and Six contend that the narrative would read more smoothly if Jesus' trip to Galilee for the Feeding of the Five Thousand in Chapter Six did not interrupt the Jerusalem

---

<sup>239</sup> John 5.16-18.

<sup>240</sup> Lincoln 2005, 209; see also Lincoln 2000, particularly 21-35.

<sup>241</sup> See Bultmann 1971, 209; Sloyan 1988, 61; Cf. Barrett 1978, 272; Smith 1965, 128-152.

<sup>242</sup> John 4.54.

<sup>243</sup> John 5.1.

<sup>244</sup> John 6.1.

<sup>245</sup> John 7.15 – See Bultmann 1971, 203 on 7.1-14 being a later addition to the narrative. Cf. Smith 1965, 152-155.

setting of Chapters Five and Seven. Leaving no room for an alternative, Bultmann goes as far as saying, “The present order of chs. 5 and 6 cannot be the original one,” and continues by asserting John 4.44 “makes no sense at all,” if Chapter Five follows Chapter Four.<sup>246</sup> There is support for this theory, albeit superficial, when one considers that two mildly puzzling details (which festival draws Jesus to Jerusalem in Chapter Five, and how Jesus got to Galilee at the opening of Chapter Six) are solved if the chapters are interchanged. However, placing a premium on easily understood fluidity of narrative is a value judgment made by the modern proponents of this position. In defending the standard order of these chapters, Barrett, referencing 2.12, demonstrates that the “Μετὰ ταῦτα” opening Chapter Six is “John’s usual expression for denoting the lapse of an undefined period.”<sup>247</sup> Keener supports this while illustrating how the evangelist is fine with assuming “major chronological as well as geographical gaps (e.g. 7.2; 10.22; 11.55)” in his narrative.<sup>248</sup> While both Barrett and Keener are correct and offer strong arguments for Chapter Five preceding Chapter Six, of primary concern for this chapter is Bultmann’s claim that, under the received order, “ch. 6 has *no connection* with ch. 5.”<sup>249</sup> Yet, no matter how subtly, having Chapter Six begin with Jesus in Galilee after the most heated exchange between him and the Pharisees and the first explicit reference to the Pharisees’ plan to murder him, shows John’s intent to represent Galilee as a safe region for Jesus and his followers. Moreover, the safety Galilee represents for the evangelist establishes a thematic connection between the two chapters, furthering arguments that support the received order of the text.

---

<sup>246</sup> Bultmann 1971, 209 – John 4.44 will be discussed extensively later in this chapter.

<sup>247</sup> Barrett 1978, 272.

<sup>248</sup> Keener 2003, 634.

<sup>249</sup> Bultmann 1971, 209 (my emphasis)

Chapters Seven and Eight are often handled as a unit in commentaries on the Fourth Gospel.<sup>250</sup> While scholars are keen on mentioning the thematic ties between the two chapters, this again has the effect of masking the geographic message that ties the preceding chapters to this unit. After the Feeding of the Five Thousand and a discourse on the bread of life in Chapter Six, Chapter Seven opens with, “Jesus went about in Galilee, for he did not wish to go about in Judaea because the Jews were seeking to kill him.”<sup>251</sup> Here, Galilee is explicitly portrayed as safe in comparison to a hostile Judea. When commenting on 7.1-9, Bultmann takes the opportunity to speak on Jesus’ “hour” coming.<sup>252</sup> Both Keener and Barrett, while pointing out that Galilee appears to be a safer location for Jesus than the other places mentioned throughout the Gospel, go on to highlight his greater conflict with Jerusalem and the world beyond.<sup>253</sup> Again, these are valuable and insightful readings of the text; however, once more they diminish the role of Galilee, as is the case with Keener and Barrett, or wholly ignore the region’s significance, in Bultmann’s analysis. Adopting the Galilee-as-a-safe-haven motif can only add to these earlier understandings of the Gospel of John.

The theme is even clearer when the textual variants are considered. A number of sources, such as Chrysostom and Augustine, attest “οὐ γὰρ ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν” in place of “οὐ γὰρ ἠθέλην.” Lindars, referencing Barrett and J. N. Sanders, argues that the former of these two variants, that Jesus did not have the ability to travel in Judea, is most likely original due to the potential uneasiness early readers may have felt when confronted with possibility of Jesus’ power being limited. Therefore, the text was quickly amended to reflect a matter of Jesus’ will, accounting for

---

<sup>250</sup> See Keener 2003; Lincoln 2005; Lindars 1972.

<sup>251</sup> John 7.1.

<sup>252</sup> Bultmann 1971, 288-289.

<sup>253</sup> Keener 2003, 704; Barrett 1978, 308-309.

the majority of manuscripts possessing the latter variant.<sup>254</sup> Despite this, Metzger argues for the opposite conclusion, citing “the overwhelming weight of external evidence” supports this latter reading that Jesus did not wish to travel in Judea.<sup>255</sup> Similar to the existence of 1<sup>st</sup> Century CE synagogues in Galilee discussed in Chapter Two of this thesis,<sup>256</sup> “οὐ γὰρ ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν” need not be original to hold significance. The variant’s attestation alone demonstrates at the very least that an early community, and possibly the evangelist himself, viewed Judea to be so hostile that Jesus had no choice but to stay in Galilee for his safety.

Understanding the implications of why the evangelist portrays Galilee as a safe location requires the examination of a narrative style found throughout the Fourth Gospel. Unique among the Gospels, John often references the driving out of believers from the synagogues.<sup>257</sup> The threat is first explicitly stated in the story of the man born blind in Chapter Nine, when the man’s parents are confronted by the Jewish authorities. When questioned about how the man can now see, the parents distance themselves, refusing to answer because, “the Jews had already agreed that if someone confessed [Jesus] as Christ, that person would be expelled from the synagogue.”<sup>258</sup> Lincoln argues that the narrator’s inclusion of the threat of expulsion is completely anachronistic and should indicate to the reader that the account in Chapter Nine, and by extension the whole Gospel, should be read with an approach that incorporates the two levels of the narrative and the experiences of the Johannine community.<sup>259</sup>

---

<sup>254</sup> Lindars 1972, 281 following Barrett 1955 (1<sup>st</sup> ed. of 1978) and Sanders 1968.

<sup>255</sup> Metzger 1994, 184-185.

<sup>256</sup> “Galilee and the Gentiles,” 40-41

<sup>257</sup> John 9.22, 12.42, 16.2.

<sup>258</sup> John 9.22.

<sup>259</sup> Lincoln 2005, 284.

Adopting the scholarly consensus that John was written after the destruction of the Second Jerusalem Temple in 70 CE,<sup>260</sup> it is conceivable that the author would collapse the political situation of his time into the narrative, just as he has done with the believers' expulsion from the synagogues. While Galilee was under Roman rule after 44 CE,<sup>261</sup> the region's proximity to and experience with Gentile nations, as well as its distance from the political and religious crucible of Jerusalem, led to relatively better relations between the Galilean population and Roman rulers.<sup>262</sup> In fact, Horsley argues that Galileans may have enjoyed fewer economic pressures as an outcome of Roman rule due to the abolishment of client-ruler taxes and tithing from the now nonexistent Second Jerusalem Temple.<sup>263</sup> Therefore, the Gospel's portrayal of Galilee as a safe place for Jesus, especially in comparison to Judea, may mirror the treatment the evangelist gives to other socio-political issues of his time.

### **Jesus as the Light That Comes From Galilee**

Safety in Galilee represents a somewhat earthly concern for the evangelist, yet the Gospel does associate the region with more theologically-charged issues as well. Central to who Jesus is in John is his designation as the light of the world.<sup>264</sup> Many scholars are quick to note that Jewish literature often associates light with both Torah and wisdom, as in Psalms 119.105 and 130, "your word is a lamp to my feet... the revealing of your words gives light," and Proverbs 6.23, "for the commandment is a lamp and the teaching a light."<sup>265</sup> The christological definition of Jesus as light is developed in two important ways. The first significant way is in contrast to

---

<sup>260</sup> See Brown 2003, 206-219 for a comprehensive overview of scholarship concerning the dating of John, though Brown himself does date at least portions of John earlier than 70 CE.

<sup>261</sup> Chancey 2002, 56.

<sup>262</sup> Freyne 1980, 91; see Freyne 1980, 78-91; Freyne 2000, 53-54; Horsley 1995, 90-93.

<sup>263</sup> Horsley 1995, 91-92.

<sup>264</sup> John 1.4-9, 3.19, 8.12, 9.5, 12.35-36, 46.

<sup>265</sup> See Keener 2003, 382-385; Lincoln 2005, 99; Barrett 1978, 84.

darkness. John discards the often horizontal dualism of the Synoptics in favor of a vertical and frequently abstract dualism, wherein the disparity between the world of Jesus and the world of human beings can be heightened.<sup>266</sup> The evangelist extends this motif by contrasting flesh, belonging to the world below, and spirit, from the realm above, in verses such as 8.23, and a person loving versus hating his or her life as in 12.25. Perhaps the most obvious dualistic pair is that of light and darkness, and in all six instances where Jesus is associated with light, the theme is also juxtaposed with darkness.<sup>267</sup>

The second crucial way in which Jesus as the light of the world is established is associated with the Fourth Gospel's frequent use of the so-called "replacement motif."<sup>268</sup> While scholars such as Lincoln focus on the replacement aspect of this Johannine device, of particular concern for this chapter is that which comes before: fulfillment. Jesus is frequently portrayed as fulfilling, and subsequently replacing, the significance of Jewish practices. At the Wedding at Cana in 2.1-12, Jesus miraculously turns six, i.e. not seven, the number of perfection/completeness, jars of water for purification into wine for the guests. "His bestowing of the conditions for human flourishing surpasses, especially the provision of the law,"<sup>269</sup> which should likely be read as saying something about the salvific nature of Jesus himself. John places the most explicit, and incendiary, reference to Jesus replacing the destroyed temple on Jesus' own lips in 2.19, something the other Gospels shy away from. Jesus' mouth is a way of giving authority to his own radical reinterpretation of the prediction. Later, in 8.12-59, John uses the motif to have Jesus, as the light of the world, stand for representations of teaching, wisdom, and

---

<sup>266</sup> See Ladd 1993, 223-224; John 8.23.

<sup>267</sup> 9.5 is the only place "darkness" is not mentioned in favor of a prediction involving the coming night in 9.4. As Keener 2003, 383 points out, John uses the images of night and day as figuratively representing light and darkness throughout the Gospel.

<sup>268</sup> Lincoln 2005, 264; see Moloney 1996 for an argument on the Johannine community being interested in "perfection" of Jewish traditions rather than their "replacement."

<sup>269</sup> Lincoln 2005, 135.

even the ideal witness. While this motif has inspired discussions of anti-Judaism in the Fourth Gospel,<sup>270</sup> these instances should not be seen as denying “the meaningfulness of the institutions and feasts but [finding] this meaning fulfilled and reinterpreted in Jesus.”<sup>271</sup> Rather, the evangelist allows for Jesus to stand in place of ideas and institutions central to Jewish thought.

These two understandings of light in the Gospel come together in the prophetic oracle in Isaiah 8.23-9.6:<sup>272</sup> “The people who walked in the darkness have seen a great light; those who dwelt in a land of deep darkness, on them has light shone.”<sup>273</sup> As discussed previously, it is clear that John allows Jesus to fulfill a wide range of features found in Judaism and the Torah; thus, it is completely within the author’s framework for Jesus to carry out the role of the light in the oracle. After recognizing the compatibility of the Isaiah verses with John’s narrative, the focus must shift to whether or not the passage directly influenced the evangelist. Keener argues against such a conclusion, contending that light is too broad a theme in Jewish literature, and thus, one should not limit its origin to a single passage.<sup>274</sup> Moreover, at least some investigations of scriptural quotations in the New Testament do not associate the oracle with John.<sup>275</sup> Yet, this ignores the similarity of ideas found between the passage and possible allusions to it in the Gospel. For example, in John 1.5 the light *shines* in the darkness just as in Isaiah 9.1 where the light is *shone* on those in the darkness. Additionally, whoever follows Jesus as the light of the world will not *walk* in darkness (8.12) just as people *walk* in darkness prior to the arrival of the

---

<sup>270</sup> See Culpepper 2001, 72.

<sup>271</sup> Brown 2003, 161 through Moloney, sees this as perhaps a softening of Brown’s earlier statements.

<sup>272</sup> This reference and all subsequent references use the LXX numbering. The oracle begins at Isaiah 9.1 in the NRSV.

<sup>273</sup> LXX Isaiah 9.1.

<sup>274</sup> Keener 2003, 739. It is true that light is a common and persistent motif throughout the Scriptures and that a single passage is unlikely to be the source for all occurrences of that motif in the New Testament; however, that does not preclude the evangelist from relying on a particular passage to develop his understanding of Jesus’ origins. That is, while John can employ both a broad understanding of the properties and significance of “the light” drawn from across the Scriptures, he can also use Isaiah 8.23-9.1 as the cornerstone of Jesus’ earthly origin.

<sup>275</sup> See Bruce 1969; Bynum 2012.



light in the oracle (8.23). The use of different Greek words for shine (“λάμπει” in Isaiah and “φαίνει” in John) and walk (“πορευόμενος” in Isaiah and “περιπατήσει” in John) should not lead one to discount the likelihood of John’s dependence on the passage from Isaiah. Even when the evangelist states he is quoting from Isaiah in John 1.23, he is either providing his own translation of a Hebrew text, pulling from a Greek translation that is non-extant, or altering the LXX himself.<sup>276</sup> In light of John’s heavy use of the fulfillment-replacement motif and the juxtaposition of light and darkness, similar to concepts found in Isaiah 8.23-9.1 and throughout the Fourth Gospel, John likely used the oracle to shape not only his narrative but also his views on some aspects of the Christology he presents.

This is particularly important for the role of Galilee in John’s Christology because Isaiah 8.23-9.6 was widely interpreted by early Christians to be a prophecy about the coming of the messiah from that very region.<sup>277</sup> Therefore, an integral part of who Jesus is in the Gospel of John is not only the light of the world, but also the light that comes from Galilee. This association is often overlooked for a number of reasons. First, Jesus’ heavenly origin is one of the most prominent themes found in the Gospel.<sup>278</sup> Surely, one way John thinks about who Jesus is involves Jesus’ divine agency as one who was sent from God; however, this should not prohibit the inclusion of Jesus’ earthly origin into John’s Christology. As Freyne writes, “it should never be forgotten that John wrote a gospel, not a revelatory discourse, and this means that the common intertext of Jesus’ earthly career was important for his purposes.”<sup>279</sup> For further evidence, one need only look at the times Jesus’ worldly origin of Galilee is explicitly mentioned

---

<sup>276</sup> John drops the “ἐτοιμάσατε” in Isaiah and brings forward “ἐυθύνετε” in John 1.23. I argue that the last of these three possibilities, that John is purposefully altering the Septuagint text, is more likely, which further supports the proposition put forward here that he is capable and willing to make slight variations to the Scriptures in order to serve a literary or perhaps theological purpose. See Williams 2005, 102-106.

<sup>277</sup> Beaton, 2005, 67.

<sup>278</sup> John 1.6, 13; 3.2, 31; 6.46, 62; 7.28-29, 33; 8.14, 42, 47; 9.16, 33; 13.3; 16.27-28, 30; 17.8.

<sup>279</sup> Freyne 2000, 292.

or referenced.<sup>280</sup> Excluding the two instances in Chapter Seven that will be discussed later, the five remaining occurrences clearly link Jesus as being from Nazareth with other christological concepts. When Phillip calls Nathanael to be a disciple, he tells Nathanael in v. 45 that Jesus *from Nazareth* is “the one about whom Moses in the law and prophets wrote.” After questioning whether or not anything good can come from Nazareth in v. 46, Nathanael, *a Galilean*, correctly recognizes Jesus as the “Son of God” and “King of Israel” in v. 49.<sup>281</sup>

In Chapter 18 when Jesus is being arrested, the Roman soldiers and Jewish guards reply to Jesus’ question “whom do you seek” with “Jesus *of Nazareth*,” to which Jesus responds with the divine name “I Am.” This happens not once but twice; the sequence is repeated after those arresting Jesus fall to the ground. The overwhelming textual support for Jesus’ earthly origin in Nazareth has resulted in many commentators wholly ignoring the seemingly mundane epithet in favor of discussing the “ἐγὼ εἰμι.”<sup>282</sup> However, one should not mistake the commonplace occurrences of “of Nazareth” in relation to Jesus to equate to a lack of significance. This is further demonstrated in the final connection of christological concepts and Jesus’ earthly home in Galilee when Jesus is on the cross. Pilate is said to have commissioned an inscription to be placed on the cross that read, “Jesus *the Nazorean*, the King of the Jews.”<sup>283</sup> The verse is rich in Johannine irony, as the reader is intended to understand that Jesus is in fact king of the Jews, though not the ruler of an earthly kingdom but a heavenly one. Nevertheless, this christological

---

<sup>280</sup> John 1.45, 46; 7.41, 52; 18.5, 7; 19.19.

<sup>281</sup> Much work has been done on Johannine Christology from a textual perspective. This work has focused on titles or motifs such as “Son of God” or “King of Israel.” Such endeavors should be seen as a focal point for the study of Christology in the Fourth Gospel, however the inclusion of location into that study, as advocated here, can lead to a more comprehensive picture. See Anderson 1997, 18-23 for a brief overview of such textual approaches.

<sup>282</sup> For textual support: Mark 1.9, 24; 10.47; 14.67; 16.6; Matthew 21.11, 26.71; Luke 4.34, 18.37, 24.19; John 1.45-46; 18.5, 7; 19.19; Acts 2.22. 3.6. 4.10. 6.14. 10.38. 22.8. 24.5. 26.9.

For Commentators: See Bultmann 1971, 639; Lincoln 2005, 444; Keener 2003, 1080.

<sup>283</sup> See Dunn 2003, 313 for a discussion on the various spellings of Nazorean and their very likely identical meanings.

idea is attached to the fact that Jesus is from Galilee, and the two identifications should be read together as informing each other's significance.

The second reason scholars do not associate Jesus as being the light which comes from Galilee centers on two key passages that superficially seem to suggest the opposite. The first of these passages occurs at the end of Chapter Four in vv. 43-54. Upon returning to Galilee from Judea by way of Samaria, the narrator intercedes with a proverb also found in the Synoptics, "For Jesus himself had testified that a prophet is without honor in his own country." This creates logical issues since Jesus is positively received in Galilee in the following verses, yet, as just demonstrated, the Gospel is quite clear that his home country is Galilee as well. To alleviate this tension, Lincoln argues that the Galileans' reception of Jesus is actually negative, citing 2.23-25 and 4.48, in which many believe in Jesus but only because of the signs he has done.<sup>284</sup> This solution may initially be appealing because it allows for Nazareth, and therefore Galilee, to still function as Jesus' land; however, the argument ignores the fact that, while not being fully adequate, John sees signs-based faith as a step in the right direction. It is this very type of faith that the disciples have at the Wedding at Cana in 2.11 and the crowds have during the Festival of Tabernacles in 7.31. Furthermore, in 10.41 many come to Jesus and believe in him after the Festival of Dedication because he has performed signs when John the Baptist had not. In 4.48, the example Lincoln cites, Jesus' rebuff is token in nature, as he does not refuse to perform the miracle on account of signs-faith.

Perhaps most importantly, the narrative of the Gospel exists inside an *inclusio* of signs-faith with 1.14 telling the reader about the glory of the Word-made-flesh which has been *seen*. The purpose statement of the Gospel in 20.30-31 closes the *inclusio* explicitly affirming that the signs were recorded so that "you may continue to believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God,

---

<sup>284</sup> Lincoln 2005, 185.

and that by believing you may have life in his name.”<sup>285</sup> Furthermore, 1 John, a text that can be seen as reflecting the beliefs of the same community from which the Gospel came, regardless of authorship, begins by placing that which “we have seen with our eyes, which we looked upon and have touched with our hands,” on equal footing with that “which we have heard.” Beyond the reality that belief in Jesus because of signs should be viewed at least relatively favorably,<sup>286</sup> there is more textual evidence to refute Lincoln’s negative reading of Jesus’ reception in Galilee.

In the prologue, the evangelist writes in v.12, “but to whoever received him, he gave to them the authority to become children of God.” Therefore, when the Galileans receive Jesus in 4.45, they should be seen as performing the correct response to Jesus’ arrival. Having already established Jesus’ origin from a town in Galilee, and now that he was positively welcomed by Galileans in accordance with the appropriate response one gives the light of the world, the proverb seemingly has only one possible allusion: Judea. Yet, if a prophet is without honor in his own country, and Judea is the only ostensible place to which the proverb could be referring, a contradiction still exists since Jesus is undoubtedly from Galilee. The solution becomes apparent when the connection with the prologue is further developed. Just as the reader should recall 1.12 when reading 4.45, he or she should also connect 4.44 with 1.11, “He came to what was his own, and his own people did not receive him.” Those who do not receive Jesus in 1.11 are often broadly affiliated with the Jews of all Israel,<sup>287</sup> as John is likely foreshadowing the Passion in addition to providing one context for why the (Jewish) Johannine community found itself expelled from the majority of the Jewish community. Therefore, the same understanding that

---

<sup>285</sup> While it is true this statement has unabashedly left the level of the narrative in favor of the level of the community, and therefore may represent an altered view on “signs faith,” it is rash to assume a full reversal of portrayal from negative to the reason why a Johannine Christian should read the Gospel. See Keener 2003, 1213-1216.

<sup>286</sup> The goal of this argument is simply to show that signs-faith does not automatically carry a negative connotation, but can be positive or value neutral.

<sup>287</sup> See Lincoln 2005, 102; Keener 2003, 398; Lindars 1972, 90.

Jesus will be rejected among the majority of his Jewish people should be applied to 4.44. The relationship is even more evident when one considers the use of the adjective ἰδιος, found in both the prologue and, *unique among the passage's uses in the New Testament*, the proverb in 4.44. John's seemingly awkward placement of the verse can be rectified by understanding it as a continuation of the narrative from the beginning of Chapter Four. When Jesus leaves Judea in 4.3, he departs from a hostile area, i.e. one comprised more heavily of those Jews who reject him, thus adding to the concern of safety for why he had to travel to Galilee. It must be noted that John is not attempting to establish a positive Galilee against a negative Judea under this paradigm, only that Galilee is safer than Judea. As discussed previously, the author of the Fourth Gospel persistently emphasizes the relative safety of Galilee for Jesus' followers over the situation in Judea, which may very well be a representation of the time the text was written.

The second passage that could incorrectly be seen to diminish the significance of Galilee occurs in Chapter Seven and accounts for the two direct references to Jesus' earthly origin omitted in the prior discussion. After Jesus' teaching on the living water, some in the crowd say, "this one is the Christ," while others respond, "Surely the Christ does not come from Galilee, does he?"<sup>288</sup> After this, the guards of the chief priests and Pharisees unsuccessfully attempt to arrest Jesus. The Jewish authorities are annoyed to discover this, yet Nicodemus steps in to defend Jesus by saying, "Our law does not judge a person if not first hearing him and learning from him what he is doing, does it?" In response, Nicodemus is mocked by the authorities, who say, "You are not from Galilee too, are you? Search and you will see that a prophet does not arise from Galilee."<sup>289</sup> The logic presented in the passage indicates Jesus is perceived to be from Galilee, and this origin is problematic for what he and others are claiming about his identity. Yet,

---

<sup>288</sup> John 7.41; see 1.46.

<sup>289</sup> John 7.51-52.

this should not lead the reader to view Galilee in a negative light. Along with the extensive evidence throughout the Gospel for Galilee's significance discussed previously, the passage itself provides the tools for understanding why the region is superficially portrayed as detrimental to Jesus' identity.

The response of the crowd in v. 41 comes after the heaviest use of the divine agency motif found in the Gospel, as questions about and references to Jesus' origin from heaven occur 10 times in 7.25-36. Therefore, when the dispute about Jesus' provenance resurfaces in 7.41, the informed reader is expected to understand that the more important issue is not Jesus' earthly origin, but his divine origin in heaven. Yet, it is important to remember that, as Freyne argued earlier,<sup>290</sup> the prominence given to Jesus' heavenly source does not automatically discredit his earthly one. Later, Nicodemus' challenge to the Pharisees also appears to invalidate Galilee, but understanding Johannine irony completely negates such a conclusion. The Pharisees are shown to be utterly unaware of the Scriptures; not only do they ignore the commandment from Deuteronomy 1.16-17 that Nicodemus is referencing, but they are also ignorant of the tradition in 2 Kings 14.25, wherein the prophet Jonah comes from Galilee.<sup>291</sup>

The average member of John's community may or may not have picked up on these scriptural references, especially the obscure allusion to a prophet from Galilee. Regardless, they would know not to trust anything from the mouths of the Pharisees, considering their role throughout the Gospel. If it is true that the evangelist was influenced by the aforementioned prophetic oracle in Isaiah 8.23-9.6, which under his Christology could prove that a legitimate messiah was capable of coming from Galilee, both the well-versed contemporaneous and modern reader might expect its use here in 7.52. One need only look to the actual proceeding verse to see

---

<sup>290</sup> Freyne 2000, 292

<sup>291</sup> See Lincoln 2005, 259-260.

this is exactly what John does. Removing the likely late, intervening pericope of The Woman Caught in Adultery,<sup>292</sup> the verses should read as follows:

They replied, “You are not from Galilee too, are you? Search and you will see that a prophet does not arise from Galilee. Again Jesus spoke to them, saying, ‘I am the light of the world.

Whoever follows me will never walk in darkness but will have the light of life.

While it is likely John does not include the specific citation because this would undermine the importance of Jesus’ divine origin stressed just prior in 7.25-36, the parallels to Isaiah 8.23-9.1 are hard to miss. John is very likely portraying Jesus as the “great light” which the people “who walk in darkness” have seen. Bringing these two verses together strongly suggests the author’s use of the oracle and therefore the significance of Galilee for his Christology.

This study of Galilee’s role in the Fourth Gospel shows the danger of underestimating the importance of this region for the evangelist. It was first demonstrated that Galilee in the gospel is a place of safety, a place where the disciples can openly fish in contrast to trembling behind locked doors in Jerusalem. John’s motives for portraying Galilee in this manner may not be entirely discernable. Perhaps it is because the community has ties to the region. Perhaps their understanding of Christianity was well received there. Or perhaps, as Josephus’ writings suggest, the area may have been more secure than Judea when the Gospel was written. This last possibility would not be entirely surprising given John’s tendency to incorporate the experiences of his community into the narrative, anachronistic or not. More remarkable is John’s use of the region in his Christology. At the heart of this discussion lies the prophetic oracle from Isaiah 8.23-9.6 that provides the means for John to see Jesus as the light of the world that comes from

---

<sup>292</sup> See Barrett 1978, 589-591.

Galilee. Furthermore, John persistently associates Jesus' worldly origin in Galilee with key christological ideas, even going so far as to tie it to the divine name, "I am." These factors, along with John's portrayal of Galilee as correctly receiving and believing in Jesus should only lead the reader to believe that the land of northern Israel is integral to understanding who Jesus was and what he came to accomplish.



## CONCLUSIONS

The first half of this thesis dealt heavily with the question of the Jewishness of 1<sup>st</sup> Century CE Galilee, setting out to demonstrate the overwhelming evidence of a predominately Jewish population at the time of Jesus. Nevertheless, those who have previously associated the region with Gentiles should not be viewed as ignorant or scholastically lazy, except in the most ideologically-driven cases.<sup>293</sup> Galilee was a gateway to the Gentile world beyond Israel, a land which accepted Hellenistic culture, and the place where Jesus himself encountered and healed foreigners.<sup>294</sup> While each of these claims were explored in detail in the first two chapters, the last, that the Gospels themselves associate Gentiles with Galilee, warrants the briefest of discussions here.

Undoubtedly we must recognize that the Gospels are a result of the world in which they were created; the acts of the early church had been successful, and Gentiles were converting to this new Jewish sect founded by an itinerant preacher who died on a cross. Thus, having Jesus point forward toward this diversified church in the Gospels validates the situation the evangelists found themselves in, and such foreshadowing occurring mostly in and around Galilee has been used to identify the region as Gentile. *However, this is a confusion of which signifier bestows significance.* That is, Galilee is not important because of the Gentile association it receives. On the contrary, Gentile inclusion in the church is given legitimacy and importance by connection with Galilee. In what better way could one declare Gentile acceptance as appropriate and significant than by attaching it to the birthplace of Jesus and his ministry? In the Gospels, Galilee

---

<sup>293</sup> See "Introduction," 1-2.

<sup>294</sup> E.g. Matthew 8.5-13.

is being brought together with Gentiles not to make demographic claims about the region, but to say something about the validity of a Jewish-Gentile church.

The latter half of *Beginning from Galilee* set out to raise further questions about the region's role and significance by examining its use in Luke-Acts and the Gospel of John. It was argued that Luke is simultaneously promoting "Judea" as a new identification for a restored Israel that includes Judea, Samaria, and Galilee while also increasing the number of times Galilee is present in shared tradition. Therefore, the evangelist is very likely attempting to retain the significance of the region inside of his new identification of a unified country. The narrative importance of Galilee in Luke-Acts necessarily had to be set aside in favor of first understanding how the evangelist even conceived of the region, yet no such problem is present in the Gospel of John. In "Galilee and the Light of the World," the thesis was brought full-circle back to Isaiah 8.23-9.1 to demonstrate the significance of Galilee in understanding who Jesus was as the light of the world. Isaiah's prophetic oracle is integral to John's Christology, with which Jesus' earthly origin could be theologized. Thus, while not entirely surprising, Galilee's significance for the Gospel writers is undeniable.

In a number of ways, no Gospel ends more brilliantly than Mark, with his exhortation: "But go, tell his disciples and Peter that he is going ahead of you to Galilee; there you will see him, just as he told you."<sup>295</sup> Thus, the reader is compelled to return to the beginning of the story, though now with the knowledge and understanding that comes from witnessing the death of the messiah; there she or he finds Jesus, who comes from and begins his ministry in Galilee. If this thesis too compels the reader to look at what he or she may be tangentially familiar with in a new light, in this case Galilee, then something has been accomplished. What has been presented above is not an exhaustive study of the region in the Gospels and Acts; many hundreds more

---

<sup>295</sup> Mark 16.7.

pages must be written before such an undertaking could be accomplished. Yet, this thesis is a beginning, a point from which constructive discussion can bring fuller understanding to our notions about the land from which Jesus' message spread to all nations.

## REFERENCES

- Aland, Kurt. *Synopsis of the Four Gospels: Greek-English Edition of the Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*. 6<sup>th</sup> ed. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1983.
- Alexander, Loveday. "Acts." Pages 1029-1061 in *The Oxford Bible Commentary*. Edited by John Muddiman and John Barton. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Allison, Dale C. *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology*. Minneapolis, MI: Fortress, 1993
- Anderson, Paul N. *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: Its Unity and Disunity in the Light of John 6*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity International, 1997.
- Bacon, B. W. "The 'Order' of the Lukan Interpolations: III The Longer Interpolation, Lk. 9:51-18:14." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 37.2 (1918): 20-53.
- Barrett, C. K. *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster, 1978.
- Beaton, Richard. *Isaiah's Christ in Matthew's Gospel*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 2002.
- Beaton, Richard. "Isaiah in Matthew's Gospel." Pages 63-78 in *Isaiah in the New Testament*. Edited by Steve Moyise and M. J. J. Menken. London, UK: T & T Clark, 2005.
- Beilby, James K., and Eddy, Paul R. *The Historical Jesus: Five Views*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2009.
- Boring, M. Eugene. *Mark: A Commentary*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2006.
- Breytenbach, Cilliers. "Mark and Galilee: The Text World and Historical World." Pages 75-85 *Galilee through the Centuries: Confluence of Cultures*. Edited by Eric M. Meyers. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999.

- Brown, Raymond Edward. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1996.
- Brown, Raymond Edward. *An Introduction to the Gospel of John*. Edited by Francis J. Moloney. New York, NY: Doubleday, 2003.
- Burton, Ernest De Witt. "The Purpose and Plan of the Gospel of Mark." *The Biblical World* 15.4 (1900): 250-55.
- Bruce, F. F. *The New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes*. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Pub., 1969.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster, 1971.
- Bynum, Wm Randolph. *The Fourth Gospel and the Scriptures*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Byrne, Brendan. *Lifting the Burden: Reading Matthew's Gospel in the Church Today*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2004.
- Chancey, Mark A. *Greco-Roman Culture and the Galilee of Jesus*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 2005.
- Chancey, Mark. *The Myth of a Gentile Galilee*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 2002.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *The Theology of St. Luke*. New York, NY: Harper, 1961.
- Culpepper, Alan R. "Anti-Judaism as a Theological Problem." Pages 61-82 in *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by R. Bieringer, Didier Pollefeyt, and F. Vandecasteele-Vanneuville. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Dahl, Nils Alstrup. "The Problem of the Historical Jesus." Pages 81-111 in *Jesus the Christ: The Historical Origins of Christological Doctrine*. Edited by Donald Juel. Minneapolis, MI: Fortress, 1953.
- Davies, W. D. *The Gospel and the Land; Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine*.

- Berkeley, CA: University of California, 1974.
- Davies, W. D., and Dale C. Allison. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Matthew*. Edinburgh, UK: T. & T. Clark, 1988.
- Deines, Roland. *Acts of God in History: Studies towards Recovering a Theological Historiography*. Edited by Christoph Ochs and Peter Watts. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Donahue, John R., and Daniel J. Harrington. *The Gospel of Mark*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2002.
- Drinkard, Joel F. "Direction and Orientation." vol. 2 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1992
- Dunn, James D. G. *Jesus Remembered*. Grand Rapids, MI: W. B. Eerdmans Pub., 2003.
- Evans, Craig A. "Fulfilling the Law and Seeking Righteousness in Matthew and the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 102-114 in *Jesus, Matthew's Gospel and Early Christianity: Studies in Memory of Graham N. Stanton*. Edited by Daniel M. Gurtner, Joel Willitts, and Richard A. Burridge. London, UK: T & T Clark, 2011.
- Evans, Craig A. *Matthew*. New York, NY: Cambridge UP, 2012.
- France, R. T. *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1998.
- France, R. T. *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids, MI: W. B. Eerdmans, 2002.
- France, R. T. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids, MI: W. B. Eerdmans Pub., 2007.
- Franklin, Eric. "Luke." Pages 922-959 in *The Oxford Bible Commentary*. Edited by John Muddiman and John Barton. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Freyne, Sean. *Galilee and Gospel: Collected Essays*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.

- Freyne, Sean. "Galilean Studies: Old Issues and New Questions." Pages 13-29 in *Religion, Ethnicity, and Identity in Ancient Galilee: A Region in Transition*. Edited by Jürgen Zangenberg, Harold W. Attridge, and Dale B. Martin. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Freyne, Sean. *Galilee, Jesus, and the Gospels: Literary Approaches and Historical Investigations*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1988.
- Freyne, Seán. *Galilee, from Alexander the Great to Hadrian, 323 B.C.E. to 135 C.E.: A Study of Second Temple Judaism*. Wilmington, DE: M. Glazier, 1980.
- Freyne, Seán. "Galilee." Pages 370-376 in vol. 2 of *Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East*. Edited by Eric M. Meyers. 5 vols. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Gal, Zvi. 1998. "Israel in Exile: Deserted Galilee Testifies to Assyrian Conquest of the Northern Kingdom." *Biblical Archeology Review* 24, no.3 (May 1998)
- Gal, Zvi. *Lower Galilee during the Iron Age*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
- Geiger, Joseph. "Language, Culture and Identity in Ancient Palestine." Pages 233-246 in *Greek Romans and Roman Greeks: Studies in Cultural Interaction*. Edited by Erik Nis. Ostenfeld, Karin Blomqvist, and Lisa C. Nevett. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2002.
- Gerdmar, Anders. *Roots of Theological Anti-Semitism: German Biblical Interpretation and the Jews, from Herder and Semler to Kittel and Bultmann*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Gill, David. "Observations on the Lukan Travel Narrative and Some Related Passages." *The Harvard Theological Review* 63.2 (1970): 199-221.
- Guelich, Robert A. *Mark 1-8:26*. Dallas, TX: Word, 1989.
- Goodacre, Mark S. *The Case against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity International, 2002.

- Goodacre, Mark S. *The Synoptic Problem: A Way through the Maze*. London, UK: Sheffield Academic, 2001.
- Graetz, Heinrich. *History of the Jews: From the Earliest times to the Present Day*. vol. 1. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1891.
- Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. London, UK: SCM, 1974.
- Herion, Gary A. "Herod the Great." Pages 161-169 in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. vol. 3 of The Anchor Bible Dictionary. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1992
- Horsley, Richard A. *Archaeology, History, and Society in Galilee: The Social Context of Jesus and the Rabbis*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity International, 1996.
- Horsley, Richard A. *Galilee: History, Politics, People*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity International, 1995.
- Hurtado, Larry. "Dogs, Doggies, and Exegesis." No Pages. 11 Oct. 2012. Online: <http://larryhurtado.wordpress.com/2012/10/11/dogs-doggies-and-exegesis/>
- Israel Antiquities Authority. *One of the Oldest Synagogues in the World Was Exposed at Migdal*. No Pages. 13 Nov. 2009. Online: [http://www.antiquities.org.il/article\\_Item\\_eng.asp?sec\\_id=25&subj\\_id=240&id=1601&module\\_id=#as](http://www.antiquities.org.il/article_Item_eng.asp?sec_id=25&subj_id=240&id=1601&module_id=#as)
- Iverson, Kelly R. *Gentiles in the Gospel of Mark: Even the Dogs under the Table Eat the Children's Crumbs*. London, UK: T & T Clark, 2007.
- Kahle, Paul. *The Cairo Geniza*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1959.
- Käsemann, Ernst. "The Problem of the Historical Jesus." Pages 15-47 in *Essays on New*



- Testament Themes*. Translated by W. J. Montague. London: SCM, 1964.
- Keller, Carl A. "Joel." Pages 578-581 in *The Oxford Bible Commentary*. Edited by John Barton and John Muddiman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Keck, Leander E. "The Introduction to Mark's Gospel." *New Testament Studies* 12.04 (1966): 352-70.
- Keenan, John P. *The Gospel of Mark: A Mahāyāna Reading*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1995.
- Keener, Craig S. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003.
- Keller, Carl A. "Joel." Pages 578-581 in *The Oxford Bible Commentary*. Edited by John Barton and John Muddiman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Kilpatrick, George Dunbar. *The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon, 1946.
- Kingsbury, Jack Dean. *Matthew as Story*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1988.
- Ladd, George Eldon. *A Theology of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. *The Gospel According to Saint John*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. *Truth on Trial: The Lawsuit Motif in the Fourth Gospel*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2000.
- Lindars, Barnabas. *The Gospel of John*. London, UK: Oliphants, 1972.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew: A Continental Commentary*. Minneapolis, MI: Fortress, 1992.
- Malamat, Abraham, and Haim Hillel Ben-Sasson. *A History of the Jewish People*. London, UK: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1976.
- Malbon, Elizabeth Struthers. *Narrative Space and Mythic Meaning in Mark*. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row, 1986.
- Malbon, Elizabeth. "The Jesus of Mark and the Sea of Galilee." *Journal of Biblical Literature*

103.3 (1984): 363-377

Malbon, Elizabeth Struthers. "The Jewish Leaders in the Gospel of Mark: A Literary Study of Marcan Characterization." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108.2 (1989): 259-81.

Marcus, Joel. *Mark 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York, NY: Doubleday, 2005.

Matera, Frank J. *Passion Narratives and Gospel Theologies: Interpreting the Synoptics through Their Passion Stories*. New York, NY: Paulist, 1986.

McCown, C. C. "The Geography of Luke's Central Section." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 57.1 (1938): 51-66.

McRay, John. *Archaeology and the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008.

Menken, M. J. J. *Matthew's Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist*. Leuven: University, 2004.

Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.

Meyers, Eric M., and Mark A. Chancey. *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2012.

Meyers, Eric M., and James F. Strange. *Archaeology, the Rabbis, and Early Christianity: The Social and Historical Setting of Palestinian Judaism and Christianity*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1981.

Meyers, Eric M. "The Current State of Galilean Synagogue Studies." Pages 127-138 in *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Lee I. Levine. Philadelphia, PA: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1987.

- Meyers, Eric M. "Galilean Regionalism as a Factor in Historical Reconstruction." Pages 93-101 in *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 221. 1976
- Meyers, Eric M. "Jesus in His Galilean Context." Pages 57-66 in *Archaeology and the Galilee: Texts and Contexts in the Graeco-Roman and Byzantine Periods*. Edited by Douglas R. Edwards and C. Thomas McCollough. Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1997.
- Moloney, Francis J. *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002.
- Moloney, Francis J. *Signs and Shadows: Reading John 5-12*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1996.
- Myers, Ched. *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2008.
- Pritchard, James B., ed. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011
- Roskam, Hendrika Nicoline. *The Purpose of the Gospel of Mark in Its Historical and Social Context*. Leiden: Brill, 2004
- Rothschild, Clare K. *Luke-Acts and the Rhetoric of History: An Investigation of Early Christian Historiography*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Ryssel, Victor. "Book of Joel." Pages 204-208 in *Jewish Encyclopedia*. Edited by Isidore Singer. New York, NY: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1916.
- Sanders, E. P. *Jesus and Judaism*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1985
- Sanders, J. N., and Brian A. Mastin. *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*. New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1968.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich. *The Life of Jesus*. Mifflintown, PA: Sigler, 1997.
- Schröter, Jens. *From Jesus to the New Testament: Early Christian Theology and the Origin of the New Testament Canon*. Translated by Wayne Coppins. Waco, TX: Baylor UP, 2013.

- Schürer, Emil. *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*. Edinburgh, UK: T. & T. Clark, 1890.
- Schwartz, Seth. "Israel and the Nations Roundabout: 1 Maccabees and the Hasmonean Expansion." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 42 (1991): 16-38.
- Shirock, Robert J. "The Growth of the Kingdom in Light of Israel's Rejection of Jesus: Structure and Theology in Luke 13:1-35." *Novum Testamentum* 35.1 (1993): 15-29.
- Sloyan, Gerard S. *John: Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching*. Atlanta, GA: John Knox, 1988.
- Stephenson, F.R. "The Date of the Book of Joel." *Vetus Testamentum* 19.1 (1969): 224-29.
- Smith, D. Moody. *The Composition and Order of the Fourth Gospel; Bultmann's Literary Theory*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965.
- Strauss, David Friedrich. *A New Life of Jesus*. London, UK: Williams and Norgate, 1865.
- Strauss, Mark L. *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and Its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic, 1995.
- Strecker, Georg. *Der Weg Der Gerechtigkeit; Untersuchung Zur Theologie Des Matthäus*. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962.
- Theissen, Gerd. *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition*. Minneapolis, MI: Fortress, 1991.
- Williams, Catrin H. "Isaiah in John's Gospel." Pages 101-116 in *Isaiah in the New Testament*. Edited by Steve Moyise and M. J. J. Menken, 2005.
- Williams, Joel F. *Other Followers of Jesus: Minor Characters as Major Figures in Mark's Gospel*. Sheffield, UK: JSOT, 1994.

# APPENDIX ONE: “GALILEE” AND “JUDEA” IN LUKE-ACTS

Table A.1: Classifications of “Galilee” in Luke-Acts		
Geographical	Bridge	Identity
<i>Luke</i>	<i>Luke</i>	<i>Luke</i>
1.26	5.17	3.1
2.4	23.49	13.1
2.39	23.55	13.2
4.14		22.59
4.31		23.6
8.26		
17.11		<i>Acts</i>
23.5		1.11
24.6		2.7
		5.37
<i>Acts</i>		9.31
10.37		
13.31		

Table A.2: Distinct and Ambiguous References to Galilee	
Distinct	Ambiguous
<i>Luke</i>	<i>Luke</i>
2.4	23.5
3.1	
5.17	<i>Acts</i>
	10.37
<i>Acts</i>	
9.31	

Table A.3: Non-unique Occurrences of “Galilee” in Luke and The Type of Material They Appear In		
All Four Gospels	Triple Tradition	Double Tradition
4.14	22.59 23.49 24.6	2.39

Table A.4: Unique Occurrences of “Galilee” in Luke and The Type of Material They Appear In			
All Four Gospels	Triple Tradition	Double Tradition	Special Luke
3.1	5.17	2.4	1.25
4.31	8.26		17.11
23.5	13.1		
23.55	13.2		
	23.6		

Table A.5: Classifications of “Judea” in Luke-Acts		
Geographical	Bridge	Identity
<i>Luke</i>	<i>Luke</i>	<i>Luke</i>
1.65	5.17	1.5
2.4		3.1
4.44	<i>Acts</i>	6.17
7.17	26.20	
21.21		<i>Acts</i>
23.5		2.9
<i>Acts</i>		
1.18		
8.1		
9.31		
10.37		
11.1		
11.29		
12.19		
15.1		
21.10		
28.21		

Table A.6: Distinct and Comprehensive References to Judea	
Distinct	Comprehensive
<i>Luke</i>	<i>Luke</i>
2.4	1.5
3.1	6.17
5.17	7.17
	23.5
<i>Acts</i>	<i>Acts</i>
9.31	1.8
12.19	2.9
15.1	8.1
21.10	10.37
	11.1
	11.29
	26.20

Table A.7: Non-unique Occurrences of “Judea” in Luke and the Type of Material they Appear in		
All Four Gospels	Triple Tradition	Double Tradition
	6.17	2.4
	21.21	3.1

Table A.8: Unique Occurrences of “Judea” in Luke and the Type of Material they Appear in			
All Four Gospels	Triple Tradition	Double Tradition	Special Luke
	5.17		1.5
	23.5		1.65
			7.17